

THE MONTH

A CATHOLIC MAGAZINE



NO. 569 (NEW SERIES 179) NOV., 1911

CONTENTS

THE IDEAS OF A CHIEF INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS.

By the Rev. Sydney F. Smith 449

SCIENCE MALIGNED?.....*By the Editor* 462

ANGLICANISM AND THE SUPERNATURAL 466

THE EDUCATION OF THE DOMICILED COMMUNITY IN INDIA
(Communicated).....*By "X."* 477

THE SPIRITUAL TESTAMENT OF JOHN SHAKESPEARE
By the Rev. Herbert Thurston 487

POPULAR RETREATS IN THE PAST.....*By the Rev. Charles Plater* 503

GRACECHURCH PAPERS. III. Miss Smollett's Ring...*By John Ayscough* 512

FLOTSAM AND JETSAM..... 524

The Unconsecrated Chalice.

Capital Punishment.

Anglican Apologetics.

A Review worth reading.

Mr. Lacey's Rejoinder.

REVIEWS 535

SHORT NOTICES 553

BOOKS RECEIVED..... 559

SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS 560

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO
LONDON & ONE SHILLING

[Editorial Offices, 31 Farm Street, Berkeley Square, W.]

STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

1. **Logic.** By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J., formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford. Second Edition. Price 5s.
 2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J., late Professor of Logic and General Metaphysics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Fourth Edition. Price 5s.
 3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J., M.A. Lond.; late Professor of Ethics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Third Edition. Price 5s.
 4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J., Professor of Natural Theology at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.
 5. **Psychology: Empirical and Rational.** By MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., D.Lit., M.A. Lond. Seventh Edition (Twenty-first to Twenty-fourth Thousand). Price 6s. 6d.
 6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. Second Edition. Price 5s.
 7. **Political Economy.** By CHARLES S. DEVAS, M.A. Oxon. Sometime Examiner in Political Economy at the Royal University of Ireland. Third Edition. Revised and Enlarged. (Tenth to Twelfth Thousand). Price 7s. 6d.
 8. **Theories of Knowledge (Absolutism, Pragmatism, Realism).** By LESLIE J. WALKER, S.J., M.A. Sometime Professor of Philosophy at Stonyhurst College. Price, 9s.
-

LONGMANS, GREEN, & Co., London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta.



The Ideas of a Chief Inspector of Schools.

A FEW months ago Mr. Edmund Gore Holmes drew to himself a good deal of public attention, and from some quarters sharp criticism, by his Circular on the appointment of School Inspectors, which had become public. His point was that they should be selected from among those who had received a University education rather than from among those who had passed through the grades of elementary teaching. We do not, however, refer to this Circular as having any present intention to consider its merits, but because Mr. Holmes has just published a book on education which seems to us chiefly, indeed perhaps solely, worthy of examination as coming from one who has himself received a University education, and has been since 1875 either Inspector or Chief Inspector of the Board of Education.

Mr. Holmes entitles his book: *What Is and What Might Be*.¹

My aim [he says in his Preface] in writing this book is to show that the *externalism* of the West, the prevalent tendency to pay undue regard to outward and visible results and to neglect what is inward and vital, is the source of most of the defects that vitiate education in this country, and therefore that the only remedy for those defects is the drastic one of changing our standard of reality and our conception of the meaning and value of life.

He apologizes to the elementary teachers of the country for going to their schools for his chief illustrations of the alleged defects; he does so only because it is in their schools that he has had his chief experience; but he deems their schools to be on the whole less deeply infected by the evil than the class of schools that rank above them, inasmuch as in their case "a breath sometimes blows the mist away and gives us sudden gleams of sunshine, whereas over the higher levels of the

¹ *What Is and What Might Be*. A Study of Education—General and Elementary in Particular. By Edmund Holmes. London, Constable & Co., 1910.

educational world there hangs the heavy stupor of profound self-satisfaction." Nor does he wish to lay the blame of these defects on the present race of teachers.

I am laying the blame of their failures not on them but on the hostile forces which have been too strong for many of them, on the false assumptions of Western philosophy, on the false standards of and false ideals of Western civilizations, on various "old, unhappy, far-off things," the effects of which are still with us, foremost among these being that deadly system of payment by results which seems to have been devised for the express purpose of arresting growth and strangling life, which bound all of us, myself included, with links of iron, and which had many zealous agents, of whom I, alas! was one.

Many of us who have had to do with schools, and have thought out in the light of experience the problems connected with them, would agree with him in deploring the deadening effects of the examination system. That is, in its excesses, for distinction should be made between that moderate use of examinations which helps to sustain effort without disturbing the quieter methods of mental training on which teachers anxious for solid results place most reliance, and that resort to the ordeal of fierce competition and the like which, whilst tending to the acquirement of knowledge more pretentious than real, does little to cultivate the higher and more inventive capacities of the mind. As for this latter educational system, however, so little need is there to trace back its origin to far-off causes, that many still living can remember when, and under what circumstances, it came into vogue. In this country it is not much more than half-a-century old, and was intended to meet two needs then felt, to give a stimulus to students at the schools and Universities who were wont to take things too easily, and to provide a means by which public appointments might be distributed on some more equable principle than that of nomination by influential persons. All the rest has grown, in this country at least, out of these simple circumstances.

But Mr. Holmes, as may be surmised from the mysterious words we have just quoted, refers to a much more elaborate causality this unfortunate examinations system with payment for results, together with the traditional educational methods of which he takes it to be the final outcome. It will hardly be believed, but he traces it all back proximately to adherence to the "path of mechanical obedience" which the custom of

centuries has trained the teachers to regard as a religious necessity, and ultimately—to the influence of the doctrine of Original Sin!

How is it done, one asks, in the same sort of spirit in which one asks the explanation of an ingenious sleight of hand? Almost any part of the book will supply the answer, for it is the characteristic of Mr. Holmes's style that, insistent as he is that children should be trained to develop their thoughts, he shows little capability of developing his own; he does but tag together a few crude thoughts into a chain of suggested causality, and then makes up his book by repeating them *ad nauseam*. But let us take a passage from his Chapter II.

The God of popular theology has been engaged for more than thirty centuries in educating his child, Man. His system has been based on complete distrust of Man's nature. In the schools which Man has been required to attend—the Legal School under the Old Dispensation, and the Ecclesiastical School under the New—it has been taken for granted that he can neither discern what is true, nor desire what is good. The truth of things has therefore been formulated for him, and he has been required to learn it by rote and profess his belief in it, clause by clause. His duty has also been formulated for him, and he has been required to perform it, detail by detail, in obedience to the commandments of an all-embracing Code, or to the directions of an all-controlling Church.

It has been further taken for granted that Man's instincts and impulses are wholly evil, and that the "Right Faith" and the "Right Conduct" are entirely repugnant to his nature. In order to overcome the resistance which his corrupt heart and perverse will might therefore be expected to offer to the authority and influence of his teachers, a scheme of rewards and punishments has had to be devised for his benefit. As there is no better nature for the scheme to appeal to, an appeal has had to be made to fears and hopes which are avowedly base. The refractory child has had to be threatened with corporal punishment in the form of an eternity of torment in Hell. And he has had to be bribed by the offer of prizes, the chief of which is an eternity of selfish enjoyment in Heaven—enjoyment so selfish that it will consist with and even (it is said) be heightened by the knowledge that in the Final Examination the failures have been many and the prize-winners few. . . . And under this system of education, as obedience is the first and last of virtues, so self-will—in the sense of daring to think and act for oneself—is the first and last of offences. . . . The path of salvation is the path of blind, passive, mechanical obedience. To deviate even a little from that path is to incur the penalty of eternal death.

We have known men who have lost their faith as completely as Mr. Holmes, but who, if they had felt bound to express the painful ideas in this quotation, would have been careful to express them with the utmost delicacy and respect for the feelings of Christian believers. But Mr. Holmes, along with his faith, appears to have lost also his altruism, and to take a positive delight in wounding our feelings with the brutality of his language. It puts us in a difficulty, for we dislike having to transfer such language to our pages, but our readers will condone our doing so; for there is an important lesson for us to learn, as we hope to make clear, from the study of this ex-Chief Inspector's book.

Will it be too much to expect of our self-confident critic that he should condescend to furnish evidence for these surprising statements? Certainly we should like to ask him where he learnt that we *all* (all, that is, who include the doctrine of Original Sin in our creed) base our ethical conceptions "on a complete distrust of man's nature," and "take for granted that he can neither discern what is true nor desire what is good," that "his instincts and impulses are wholly evil, and that 'Right Faith' and 'Right Conduct' are entirely repugnant to his nature." It is true the Lutheran *Formula of Concord*, and the Calvinist *Helvetic Confession*, two sixteenth century documents, give some sanction to his notion; nor is the language of the Anglican Ninth Article particularly satisfactory; but Mr. Holmes is speaking of nineteenth century Christians, whereas the number of present-day Protestant teachers who stand by the letter of these antiquated formulæ, or even near it, must be a negligible quantity. In any case by what right does he include in his indictment the members of the largest Christian community in the world, of a Church which not only has never subscribed to these grotesque Lutheran statements, but from the first has consistently opposed them, and framed her canons to condemn them. Doubtless the Catholic Church holds the doctrine of Original Sin. She holds it not as the result of an inference, but as a truth communicated to her keeping by the Apostles, in the name of their Master. But having received it from this safe source she has sought to correlate it with other doctrines and with natural facts, and in so doing has ever shown what Lutherans and Calvinists lacked, and what Mr. Holmes and his congeners likewise lack so conspicuously, a sense of proportion. According to her theology the state in which Man was created was a *supernatural* state, that is, a state in which,

superadded to what belonged to his nature, he had other endowments which though in no sense due to his nature as requisites for its full expansion, were admirably suited to it, healed some of its intrinsic infirmities—namely, the liability to death and disease, and that ethical infirmity which we call concupiscence—and finally elevated it to an ultimate destination far beyond its deserts. And when the Fall came it was, according to this theology, a fall from the *supernatural* to the natural, and by no means from the natural to something beneath the natural. In other words, man after the Fall has retained all that belongs to his nature, which, if it has now to be regarded as stained by a sin of origin, is so regarded solely by reference to the fall from a state still higher, just as, if one may compare great things with small, the son of a peer who has been attainted in blood, has all that a commoner has, but with a difference which we regard as a family stain. Still, just as this son of a peer, though through no fault of his own, cannot avoid contracting the family stain, but incurs no positive punishment (as his father may have done), so the inheritor of original sin is under no sentence of personal punishment, unless he have also personally sinned. Such is the Catholic interpretation of the doctrine of Original Sin, an interpretation which is as old as the hills, and one thing that follows from it is that, as the Catholic theologians often note, it does not furnish, and does not pretend to furnish, an explanation of that downward tendency in human nature which we call concupiscence.

This universal fact, however, which disbelievers as well as believers in Christianity are constrained to recognize, is sufficiently explained by the dual character of man's nature, in which "spirit" and "flesh," in St. Paul's terminology, "higher and lower nature," in that of more recent moralists, war against each other, each striving to draw the choice of the free will to its side. And this being so, it appears how irrelevantly Mr. Holmes has dragged the doctrine of Original Sin into his argument, and sought to gather from it what he certainly could not have gathered from any direct observation of the thought and talk of believers in Christianity, namely, that in their view man is incapable of appreciating right faith and right conduct for its own sake; that in their view "it is impossible for the lawgiver to appeal to man's better nature, to say to him, 'Cannot you see for yourself that this course of action is better than that, that love is better than hatred, mercy than cruelty, loyalty than treachery, continence

than self-indulgence''; that in their view "all that he can and must say to him is this and this only, 'If you obey the law you will be rewarded, if you disobey it you will be punished.'"

By Mr. Holmes's leave the former of these two appeals is in the very foreground of our appeals to our own consciences and the consciences of those we have to instruct or exhort; and is so because our principles require it, as he might have known had he taken the smallest pains to find out. And, if he will persist in forcing on us the comparison between our employment of this appeal and that of his own friends, though we dislike such comparisons, and can only accept this as between believers in the religion of Jesus Christ and disbelievers of the aggressive class which Mr. Holmes represents, we shall venture to claim that, as tested by the kind of lives which the appeal inspires and evokes on either side, the Christian's perceptions of what is good and of what is in good, have this advantage over those of his traducers, that they are far more exact, more penetrating, more delicate, and more sympathetic. If we may be pardoned for suggesting the parallel, it is like the difference between the study of the human countenance by some great master and by some pavement artist, as evidenced in the portraits in which respectively their perceptions find expression.

But the former appeal does not exclude the latter, and the appeal to rewards and punishments in a life to come is indispensable and good. On the one hand there are those who resist all appeals to the intrinsic goodness of the virtues and the intrinsic loathsomeness of the vices. It is unbecoming that these should be allowed to flout the moral law with impunity, which points to the need of a time of retribution hereafter, as there is none sufficient at this side of the grave. What should be the character and gravity of that future punishment is a question that is beside the scope of the present argument. We cannot but observe, however, the fierce persistency with which so many of those in revolt against the Christian religion discharge the billows of their wrath against this doctrine, just as if they were under the dominion of a terror lest it should be the truth after all, and this terror stirred them to frenzy. For a Christian who strives to live up to the ideals of his religion this doctrine of future punishment may inculcate a salutary fear, which is its object, but it has no terrors, for it is the love of right for its own sake to which his religion has carefully trained him, and still more the love of it for the sake of the God of Love whose good-

ness is resplendent in it; it is this which guides and supports him along his daily path. Where the doctrine of future reward comes in for him is that, as he treads this daily path, he is encouraged and sustained by a well-founded consciousness that it leads to the God he loves, to a closer and more manifest companionship with Him and with all others who have preferred this path of right to the broad road of evil; that it leads to a final triumph of right over wrong, when right will no longer be constrained, as must be during these days of its conflict with the wrong, to repress anything of the fulness of its power to beautify the soul.

So far Mr. Holmes, in the passage we have transcribed, has pointed out to us what he conceives to be the features in the Christian religion that have wrought such injury to our educational system, particularly by strangling it in the noose of the examination system with payment by results. It remains to see how he establishes the relation of cause and effect between two things which most people would have considered to be widely apart. The following extracts will suffice to show his meaning.

In the West men have loyally striven to reproduce towards their children the supposed attitude of the God of wrath towards themselves. From very tender years the child has been brought up in an atmosphere of displeasure and mistrust. His spontaneous activities have been repressed as evil. His every act has been looked upon with suspicion. He has been ever on the defensive, like a prisoner in the dock. He has been ever on the alert for a sentence of doom. He has been cuffed, kicked, caned, flogged, shut up in the dark, fed on bread and water, sent hungry to bed, subjected to a variety of cruel and humiliating punishments, terrified with idle—but to him appalling—threats. . . . But of all the cruelties to which he has been subjected, the most devilish has been that of making him believe in his own criminality, in the corruption of his innocent heart. In the deadly shade of that chilling cloud, the flower of his opening life has too often withered before it has had time to expand. . . . We tell the child that he is a criminal, and treat him as such, and then expect him to be perfect; and when our misguided education has begun to deprave him, we shake our heads over his congenital depravity, and thank God that we believe in "original sin."

In the next place, if man is to be faithful to his model, he must bring up the child to an atmosphere of vexatious interference and unnatural restraint. . . . What he has suffered at the hands of his

Schoolmaster—the God of Israel (and of Christendom)—he has taken good care to inflict on his pupil, the child. Such phrases as “Don’t talk,” “Don’t fidget,” . . . “Don’t ask questions,” . . . “Don’t make a mess,” are ever falling from his lips. And they are supplemented with such positive instructions as: “Sit still,” . . . “Hands behind backs,” . . . “Eyes on the blackboard.” At every turn—from infancy till adolescence, “from early morning till late in the evening”—these “dead and deadening formulae” await the unhappy child. The aim of the teacher is to leave nothing to his nature, nothing to his spontaneous life, nothing to his free activity; to repress all his natural impulses; to drill his energies into complete acquiescence; to keep his whole being in a state of sustained and painful tension.

A fearful picture truly, and Mr. Holmes can find no meaning in the system except by supposing that the object is “to turn the child into an animated puppet” who will be ready to dance to the strings which his teacher pulls. Nor is he surprised that the child’s energies, in their reaction against so unnatural a system, should find relief in unpleasant forms of naughtiness and even in hooliganism. The hooligan’s “wild, ruffianly outrages are,” he thinks, “perhaps the last despairing effort that his vital principle makes to assert itself, before it finally gives up the struggle for active existence.”

But all this repression is, it seems, merely to prepare the way for what is to follow. It serves to break down the child’s spirit, and render his mind passive under a process of mechanical obedience. In the “two great schools,” of Judaism and Christianity, “freedom and initiative have ever been regarded as the gravest offences.”

For if any lingering desire to think things out for himself, if any intelligent interest in what was taught, survived in the disciple, the whole system of salvation by machinery would be in danger of being thrown out of gear. . . . Blind, passive, literal, unintelligent obedience is the basis on which the whole system of Western education has been reared. The child must distrust himself absolutely, must realize that he is as helpless as he is ignorant, before he can begin to profit by the instruction that will be given to him. . . . The golden rule of education is that the child is to do nothing for himself which his teacher can possibly do, or even pretend to do, for him. Were he to try to do things by or for himself, he would probably start by doing them badly. This is not to be tolerated. . . . He must therefore trust himself to his teacher (who) must stand in front of him and give such directions as these: “Look at me,” “Watch my hand,” “Do the

thing this way," "Repeat it all together," "Say it three times." And the child, growing more and more comatose, must obey these directions and ask no questions.

To the question what object can such a system serve, Mr. Holmes supposes that the teachers who have to carry it out would, if they were capable of thinking, reply that their business is not to train the mind of the child, but to drill the child into the mechanical production of quasi-material results, his success in doing which will be gauged in due course by an "examination;" an examination which will be exacted because "what is outward and visible counts for everything in the West, first in the life of the adult, and then in the life of the child," and "the idea of weighing and measuring the results of education . . . has come to establish itself in every Western land."

We are at last getting near what the reader has been waiting for, the artifice by which this Chief Inspector will fix on the Christian religion the responsibility for the severe examination system now so highly in favour. After treating his readers to several pages of somewhat commonplace talk on the difference between information imparted and knowledge digested, and after assuring them that "the confusion between information and knowledge lies at the heart of the religion, as well as of the education of the West," Mr. Holmes at last announces the conclusion to which he has been working up: "that education in the West should ultimately be controlled by a system of formal examination, may be said to have been predestined by the general trend of religious thought and belief."

Wherever literal obedience is regarded as the first, if not the last, condition of salvation, the tendency to measure worth and progress by the outward results that are produced will inevitably spring up and assert itself. In this tendency we have the whole examination system in embryo. When Israel, with characteristic thoroughness, had embodied in Pharisaism the logical inferences from his religious conceptions, a merciless examination system came into being, in which the whole of human life was dragged out (as far as possible) into the fierce light of public criticism, and placed under vigilant and unintermittent supervision. When Pharisaism was revived . . . under the name of Puritanism, the tendency to arraign human life at the bar of public opinion . . . gave rise . . . to an intolerable spiritual tyranny. In Catholic countries the believer is subjected to a periodical oral examination, in which he passes under review the outward aspect of his

inward and spiritual life, detailing for the benefit of his confessor his sins of ceremonial omission or laxity. . . . Even in the Anglican Church . . . the clergyman is apt to measure the spiritual health and progress of his parishioners by the frequency with which they attend church and "Celebration." . . . It was inevitable, then, that, the relation between religion and education being what it was and is, sooner or later the education of the young should come under the control of a system of formal examination and that it should be as much easier to apply the system to education than to religion as it is easier to test knowledge (in the conventional sense of the word) than conduct.

Now that we have this ex-Chief Inspector's complete theory before us, we feel moved to ask him a question or two. How is it that an effect like this—of an educational system controlled by formal examination with payment by results—predetermined as it has been by religious forces that have worked for quite two thousand years, did not come into being till the middle of the nineteenth century? And again, inasmuch as he ever speaks of the defective system as peculiar to the West ("the externalism of the West . . . is the source of most of the defects that vitiate education in this country," "I lay the blame . . . on the false standards and the false ideals of Western civilizations," "the confusion between information and knowledge lies at the heart of the religion as well as the education of the West," and so on), where in the East may we find the happy region in which this externalism, these false standards and false ideas, this confusion between information and knowledge, have never prevailed, and educational results putting the West to the blush have been proportionately attained? Or again—inasmuch as, in the one brief and obscure passage in which he does touch on the education of the East, he praises the Founder of Buddhism as "the greatest educationalist, as well as the greatest moralist, that the world has ever known," and avows that "the vista which the idea of self-realization [his term for the object of education] opens up to him goes far beyond the limits of any one earth-life or sequence of earth-lives, and far, immeasurably far, beyond the limits of the sham eternity of the conventional Heaven and Hell"—are we to understand that he would have our present English system remodelled so as consciously to promote not merely the self-realization of the children attending our schools in their present state, but also the further self-realization of their continued selves in any future reincarnations they may, on this stupendous hypothesis, be required to undergo?

Once more, coming back to things present and at hand, we should like to ask Mr. Holmes for some sufficient array of the facts which have come under his eyes and led him to take so gloomy a view of the present state of our Elementary Schools. In how many conversations with the teachers has he asked them about their ideals, the ideals to which they have been trained, and has elicited that it was their ideal to keep their children in "an atmosphere of displeasure and mistrust, and to repress all their spontaneous activities as evil, to multiply corporal punishments and appalling threats," and generally to make the child "believe in his own criminality." We all know that a generation or two ago a type of education prevailed which was both stern and shallow, though we may doubt whether even then, apart from some exceptional Dotheboys Halls, it was inspired by such ideas as are now suggested rather than fashioned by mere ignorance and incompetence. But a change has passed over the world since then, and very different ideals as to the art of handling children have come into universal favour. What grounds can Mr. Holmes allege beyond his mere *ipse dixit* that the old system and worse than the old system prevails in the Elementary Schools of the day? To one class of such schools he renders testimony, for which we make him our acknowledgments, but which tells dead against his general contention. "There are schools," he tells us, "mostly in the slum regions of great towns"—and a footnote adds that he is thinking of the Roman Catholic Schools in the Irish quarter of Liverpool—"in which the devotion, the sympathetic kindness, and the gracious bearing of the teachers have won from the children the response of unselfish affection, attractive manners, and happy faces." That does not look as if these children were brought up to think themselves criminals incapable of good impulses, or that they were mistrusted and over-punished, and he might find the same wherever a Catholic school is at work, notwithstanding that the teachers are all firm believers in the doctrine of Original Sin. We all indeed fall short of our ideals somewhat, and not all teachers are equally competent, but we are talking of the ideals that prevail everywhere in our schools. We are not in a position to speak with the same authority of other Voluntary schools or of Council schools, but it is matter of common knowledge that they strive to carry out, frequently with great success, the same ideals so far as they involve treating the children with kindness and sympathy

striving to lead them rather than to drive them, seeking to arouse in them a keen interest in their lessons, and with this object, at the cost of great self-sacrifice, often taking them for walks in the fields or visits to museums, or resorting to similar plans; nor is it likely that the doctrine of Original Sin holds a very prominent place in their minds.

These are some of the questions we should like to put to Mr. Holmes. But we desist, for we begin to fear lest our readers may think we are taking him too seriously. What else, they may ask, can he be save a monomaniac of the anti-religious species? And indeed, whilst occupied with him in preparation for this article, we have been irresistibly reminded of a certain Mr. Richard Bagley, better known as Mr. Dick, and his Memorial. Mr. Dick, having been warned by a judicious friend that "it was not a businesslike way of speaking," "had been for upwards of ten years endeavouring to keep King Charles the First out of his Memorial." Mr. Holmes has apparently had no such judicious friend at his side to urge him to keep the doctrine of Original Sin out of his book, and so it has got in many times over, in a decidedly unbusinesslike way.

But, we repeat, the special interest in this book lies in the fact that it reveals the sentiments of one who since 1875 has been an Inspector, and from 1906 to 1910 was the Chief Inspector under the Board of Education. Frequently we receive assurances from those in power that, such is the spirit of impartiality reigning in that department, no one need fear lest, in its administration of the schools, action hostile to the religious convictions of any parent should ever be taken, even if a purely undenominational *régime* should at any time come in. But in England it is not really electoral majorities that determine the policy of governing bodies. Into the governing body of a Trades Union or a County Council, the majority of whose members are not Socialist, some enterprising Socialist quietly creeps till he finds himself in a privileged position; and then at once he proceeds with great caution but with great determination, to shape the policy of the Union or Council in a Socialistic direction, those opposed to Socialism being no longer able to overrule him. And here likewise in a singularly privileged and influential position on the staff of the Board of Education we find there can be men who regard the Christian religion, in view of what they take to be its doctrine of Original Sin and of what is approximately its doctrine of future rewards and punishments,

as a canker at the roots of all educational effort, which must be cut out before a healthy education of the children can be hoped for—for that, we suppose, is what Mr. Holmes means when he tells us, in words already quoted, that “the only remedy for these [educational defects] is the drastic one of changing our standard of reality and our conception of the meaning and value of life.” If the Board of Education can rely on the counsels of men of that sort, is it easy to believe that the consciences of the children are safe in their hands? Evidently we shall do well not to relax our hold on our own Catholic schools.

S. F. S.

Science Maligned?

THERE certainly seems to be need of a plain statement touching certain scientific matters in regard of which the public are constantly presented with various information which cannot easily be reconciled.

On the one hand, we are all familiar with the positive assurances of writers in the newspapers and magazines that in "science" mankind may find all it requires for the satisfaction of its desires not merely practical but intellectual; on the other, we are told no less emphatically that to attribute to her any such pretension is a mere calumny, and an unfair device for trumping up a charge against her as though she had belied her promises.

To this effect we have recently heard an indignant protest from so high an authority as Sir E. Ray Lankester,¹ who is exceedingly wroth because some "glib gentleman" has charged science with not answering questions which she never supposed she could answer,—problems which it is misleading and injurious to suppose that she ever proposed to solve.

It is not the first time that Sir Edwin has made a somewhat similar protest, though on a former occasion his utterances, despite a certain superficial similarity, had in reality no resemblance at all to that of which we speak. It was as President of the British Association, at York (August 1, 1906), that he censured the late M. Brunetière for venturing to speak of the "bankruptcy of science," "as if she had no new things in store for humanity." But here Sir Edwin was speaking of physical advances—astronomical in particular—which no one can possibly doubt to be within her scope, or fancy it injurious to ascribe to her. What Brunetière meant—as he himself clearly explained—was that whilst science has manifestly done all and more than all which she ever undertook within her own province, she has done nothing whatever to transcend its limits, or to

¹ "Science from an Easy Chair," *Daily Telegraph*, October 2, 1911.

throw any light on "those beliefs and hopes which we call religion." That in this respect science is wholly incompetent Sir E. Ray Lankester appears fully to acknowledge. No real man of science, he declares,¹ has ever pretended that we know, or can even conceive the possibility of knowing anything concerning such matters: "These things are not 'explained' by science, and never can be."

But is it not true that a very different account is given by those writers who claim to be the accredited expositors of science and commonly have their claim allowed? To listen to them, might we not suppose that she is ready to provide us all with a complete outfit, mental, moral, and spiritual, and with a fulness of knowledge in comparison with which all other philosophies are but as Egyptian darkness, and if we are told that we should not take too seriously those who chatter freely on such subjects, shall we not find a good deal to bear them out on the part of authorities of greater weight? Is it not noteworthy, to begin with, that men of scientific eminence, like Sir E. R. Lankester himself, should be so tolerant of what must appear to them to be pestilent nonsense, when it floods our journals and magazines, and should reserve their indignation for such as base upon it a charge like that which has called forth his diatribe?

In the way, moreover, of more positive evidences. What is to be thought of the claims advanced by no less a person than Professor Huxley on behalf of science, or "Natural Knowledge," in the first of his famous *Lay Sermons*, in which he set himself to show the paramount importance of such knowledge, and the benefits to be expected from it, amongst which we certainly seem to find a good deal which we may be forgiven for doubting whether science has yet realized.

We are assured that she is not merely a fairy godmother of unexampled bounty, equipping men with such material advantages as steam engines, and telegraphs, and spinning jennies, but a real mother, supplying ideas which alone can satisfy spiritual cravings.

Far from exhibiting herself as a mere comfort-grinding machine that can do no more for our race than make life somewhat more tolerable, better provided with food and covering and less liable to pestilence, science has, we are told, enlarged

¹ In *The Times*, May 19, 1903.

our mental frontiers, for the whole of modern thought is steeped in it, modern civilization rests upon physical science, which has made its way into the works of "our best poets" and sets its mark even upon the mere man of letters, though he is fond of assuming that he dwells in quite a higher sphere.¹

Nor is this all. We are further assured that in the very matter of religion itself science alone can teach anything worth learning—and has taught men the only right road in cherishing the noblest and most human of their emotions by worship "for the most part of the silent sort," at the altar of the unknown and unknowable.²

This, no doubt, does not go very far towards the satisfaction of the enquiring mind, but it seems clear that on the authority of one of her most widely accepted representatives science has undertaken to do a great deal to which we are now assured she never pretended.

But there is a good deal more to be said on the subject. Although Sir E. Ray Lankester never names the particular antagonist at whom he girds, it is clear that he has a very definite person in view, and it would further appear that he finds it specially offensive that a mere literary critic should presume to meddle with scientific questions. Accordingly, he has no hesitation in treating such an opponent in a very curt and summary fashion. He is greatly angered to find it declared that biologists, if asked by what method the evolution in which they believe has been brought about, can return no answer. This Sir Edwin pronounces to be "a most extraordinary perversion of the truth," for "Darwin showed the method by which evolution can and must be brought about." To add to the grievousness of his offence, "our misleading writer" goes on to say that Darwin's theory, as exhibited by himself, "is generally considered now-a-days to be inadequate." This, says Sir E. Ray Lankester, is "fallacious." "Darwin's theories are generally held to be essentially true. They are adequate, because they furnish the foundation on which we build."

It is true, no doubt, that Sir E. Ray Lankester himself, and certain other distinguished biologists, continue to fly the old flag of fifty years ago, and to talk as though we were still in the 'sixties. But can it be said that such an attitude represents that of present-day science, or justifies such pronouncements as we have just heard? Is Darwinism pure and simple, as Sir E. Ray

¹ *Lay Sermons*, p. 117.

² *Ibid.* p. 16.

Lankester or Professor Poulton proclaim it, the general creed of contemporary scientific men? How, then, explain the emphatic declaration of so competent a witness as Professor Driesch,¹ "Darwinism fails all along the line," or of an eminent anatomist who declares that whilst the uneducated are prating about the triumph of Darwinism, "it is fast losing caste among men of science."²

It might seem, in view of such testimonies, that even a poor literary man has something to say for himself when he speaks of Darwinism as no longer so fashionable in scientific circles as once it was. He might, perhaps, go further, and express a doubt as to whether his censor is not living rather in the "dead past" than in the actual present.

But a still graver consideration arises. In view of the sweeping and confident statements which are so commonly heard, the idea is widely entertained that all who wish to show themselves truly scientific must unhesitatingly proclaim themselves "evolutionists," and that no one who has any self-respect will venture to express any doubt at all upon the subject. It seems to be very generally forgotten that after all we *know* next to nothing about it. No doubt there is much in organic nature which leads to the belief that plants and animals as they now exist have developed by a natural process from primitive forms, just as do chickens from eggs and oak trees from acorns. But it all remains matter of inference and not of scientific demonstration. What the process of Evolution has been, no one can pretend to say in any single instance, nor has an intermediate form ever been discovered linking two species together.

It still remains true that the Evolution theory in its fulness is accepted by many biologists with a facility which is puzzling to men who are acquainted with the stringent demands for evidence which are made in other departments—that, in fact, as Professor Weismann has acknowledged of Darwinism, Natural Selection in particular is accepted as a satisfactory explanation not because we can show that it does the work, or even imagine how it does it, but simply because no other possible substitute is to be found for a principle of design, with which it is resolved at any cost to dispense. This is, no doubt, a principle very widely entertained. Whether it be scientific is another question.

J. G.

¹ *Gifford Lectures*, 1907, p. 269.

² Dwight, *Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist*, p. 20.

Anglicanism and the Supernatural.

IF it is true, as is sometimes said, that Anglicanism has little or no theology, it would seem that the reason is not far to seek. When it took upon itself to undermine the foundations on which the Church in this country had stood, it was inevitable that the supports would no longer prove equal to the task of sustaining the edifice. Probably there are few who will dispute the fact that whatever may be the case to-day, once, at least, Anglicanism was Protestant. It is not a difficult thing for us to sympathize with certain Anglicans of the present day who deplore the worse than criminal folly of those weak, misguided, and perhaps ill-instructed ancestors who bartered away that inheritance which ought to have been theirs. But now it is evidently with satisfaction that Bishop Gore, in his *Orders and Unity*, speaks of "the breaking down and weakening of the positive and distinctive types of Protestantism." Neither dogmatic Lutheranism nor the definite religion of Calvinism is to-day a force to be reckoned with, while the teaching of the various Nonconformist bodies "is merging in the common undenominational type of religion."¹

Presumably the "definite religion" of Anglicanism, whatever it may be, is not considered to be in such a parlous condition. Indeed, not a little enthusiasm regarding its present and its future found expression at the recent Church Congress. And yet there were many speeches made and sermons preached at that Congress which, echoing as they do teaching that is far from uncommon at the present day, are calculated to give pause, one would think, to those enthusiasts who have but few misgivings as to the future of Anglicanism. To an outsider it appears that many of these Anglican clergymen are regarding the decay of supernaturalism in their midst with equanimity, some with positive approbation. To the Catholic apologist the supernatural is the foundation upon which Christianity rests, while to many

¹ Pp. 190, 191.

modern Anglicans it is an incubus to be got rid of altogether. Of course it is recognized that there are certain inherited elements of Christian teaching which have always been held to be supernatural. But these, it is said, must now be recast in a mould of naturalism.

Sir John Seely's *Natural Religion* [writes Canon Masterman]¹ is the best and most eloquent exposition of the view that regards the Christian Church as "simply the spiritual side of the great organism of civilized society throughout the western world," and appeals for the abandonment of supernaturalism as a merely accidental feature of religion.

This view or something like it was voiced at the time of the Oxford Movement even by Keble, and the fact is perhaps suggestive of the radically different view of the Catholic Church as held by those Tractarians who elected to go and those who elected to stay. Certainly, it would be difficult to imagine Newman describing the Church as "only a body providentially raised up to hold the best and purest philosophy—helped, as all good things are, from above, but in itself no more than the heroical and divine phase of the present life."

But we may go back further still to find an explicit denial of the supernatural by a representative Anglican—William Law—who, according to Dr. Inge, quoting the passage, "holds a prominent place among English mystical writers."

There is nothing [Law says] that is supernatural in the whole system of our redemption. Every part of it has its ground in the workings, and powers of nature, and all our redemption is only nature set right, or made to be that which it ought to be. There is nothing that is supernatural but God alone; everything beside Him is subject to the state of nature. There is nothing supernatural in the mystery of our redemption but the supernatural love and wisdom which brought it forth.

The Christian religion is the only true religion of nature; it has nothing in it supernatural.

Nothing can be done to any creature supernaturally, or in any way that is without, or contrary to, the powers of nature.²

And yet Dr. Inge tells us that he knows "no better summary of the theology and ethics of Christian mysticism" than the particular treatise in which the above passages occur. For us it

¹ *National Churches*, pp. 27, 28.

² Dr. Inge, *Studies of English Mystics*, pp. 167, 168.

is enough that it is the language neither of St. Augustine nor of the Catholic Church, while it is directly repugnant to the teaching of St. Paul, particularly as conveyed in his Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. If it were true of the Redemption that "every part of it has its ground in the workings and powers of nature," how could it be instrumental in raising the soul to an order higher than the natural? But perhaps Law, followed by Dr. Inge and such writers as Dean Freemantle, would hold that the worship of God and co-heirship with Christ to the Kingdom of Heaven are within the natural powers of man to achieve. If so, it is Pelagianism pure and simple, and is another evidence of the spread of what the Fathers and the Catholic Church have always denounced as heresy. And when men who dwell in the Cathedral Close hold these views, we must not be surprised if these same views are generally accepted by the man in the office, the man in the workshop, the man in the club, as well as by the man in the street.

A writer in an Anglican journal recently declared that Anglicanism had arrived at the parting of the ways, and that the time had arrived when it must choose between historic Christianity or adopt the position of Canon Henson and content itself with undenominationalism, making terms with any heresy old or new, but that it was impossible to hold a middle course much longer.

Some will undoubtedly continue to cling to the *via media*, but after all they are only a "Party" of a sect, and their chances of becoming the acknowledged representatives of the Anglican Church are very remote. The fortunes of that Church must be in the future, as they have been in the past, inextricably interwoven with political issues, and politics do not favour supernaturalism. The interests of the people are absorbed in industrial and economical questions, and neither do these favour supernaturalism. Cowper-Templeism as received by the mass of the population will do but little to promote supernaturalism, and hence church services which, generally speaking, are the ordinary outward expression of supernatural religion, become more and more unpopular.

A year ago Bishop Gore, at the Church Congress, declared, according to the *Times* report, that—

the Anglican Communion would certainly be rent in twain on the day on which any non-episcopally ordained minister was formally allowed within their Communion to celebrate the Eucharist, and that any

Colonial Church of their Communion which recognized in that way the validity of non-Episcopal Orders would either be disowned by other parts of the Anglican Communion, or, if that were not the case, would cause what he had described as the division within their Communion at home.

Since then, if a non-Episcopally ordained minister has not celebrated the Eucharist in an Anglican church, at least a common communion service for Anglicans and Nonconformists has been recommended and permitted by an Anglican prelate; but there are no signs of any rending in twain of the Anglican Communion, at least on that account. The condemnation of Colenso's writings, the Hampden controversy, the Gorham Judgment, the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, *Ecce Homo*, and other works raised points of Christian dogma, as the Rev. Cyril Emmet reminded us in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* for October, on which Anglican feeling at the time was very acute. Protests were made, but soon the situation and the views were both accepted and things went on as before, except that another and another precedent had been established for setting aside teaching and ordinances accepted throughout the whole of the Catholic world. The significant point is not that there should be these protests against a movement which trends farther and farther away from the Catholic Church, but that such protests should prove hopelessly ineffectual to arrest the movement. Of course the point of view of those who have joined it is, as Dean Freemantle says, that "the Church should be as wide as possible," and that as "truth is dynamic, not static," according to the Reverend Mr. Emmet, "it is necessary to 'press forward' in order to keep pace with it."

Again, Bishop Gore, when, a year ago, he prophesied such dire results if a Colonial Church should recognize the validity of non-Episcopal Orders, knew very well that a brother Bishop on the occasion of a Christmas Ordination in Hereford Cathedral had declared that "the kingdom of Christ has no sacerdotal system." A certain amount of consternation was created when the Bishop of Hereford made the statement. To-day the Bishop of Carlisle's sermon at the Church Congress, in which he said that "it is sufficient for true Catholic Churchmanship that men be called to their ministry and ordained for it, whether that ordination be presbyteral or episcopal" is noticed by the Press only to be approved. "At the root of these ecclesiastical notions of Catholicity," declares the Bishop, "lies the canker of

clericalism," but, should the day come for some successor to the Bishop of Carlisle to be dragged from his episcopal throne, his presbyteral ordination will not save him against the cry "clericalism is the enemy" in which a predecessor had so light-heartedly joined.

Probably the "clericalism" of Bishop Diggle is not very different from the "sacerdotalism" of Canon Henson, which is, so avers the Canon, "threatening to bring back the long-abrogated reign of the priest, and to re-establish the long-vanished system of mediæval sacramentalism."

Whether it be the "clericalism" of Bishop Diggle or the "sacerdotalism" of Canon Henson, it is fairly clear that it is supernaturalism that is the object of the hostility both of the one and the other. Now and again an expression may be used which may seem to savour of supernaturalism, but a further acquaintance with the thought of modern Anglicans shows the complacency with which every Christian dogma is submitted to a naturalistic interpretation. The Bishop of Carlisle may appeal to the "unchangeableness of the One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism," but we are fain to ask him what do the terms mean. There is teaching abroad among Anglicans regarding the Divinity of our Lord which suggests St. Paul's question—"Is Christ divided?" And the Faith as held by Anglicans is no more One to-day but rather less, than when Macaulay wrote against Gladstone.

Unity, he tells us, is essential to truth. And this is most unquestionable. But when he goes on to tell us that this unity is the characteristic of the Church of England, that she is one in body and spirit, we are compelled to differ from him widely. The apostolical succession she may or may not have. But unity she most certainly has not and never has had.

To-day, as fifty years ago, "it is, in fact, a bundle of religious systems without number."

And what is meant by "One Baptism"?

The Bishop of Carlisle, in inveighing against those who would make Confirmation a "test of churchmanship or the only gateway to the Table of the Lord," describes Baptism as "Christ's own sacramental sign and seal." But is it no more than a "sign and seal"? It is many years ago now since it was proved to be possible to deny the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration and yet remain a good Anglican and capable of

Church preferment, so we are not surprised on turning to the pages of Dean Freemantle's recently published *Natural Christianity* to find that all supernaturalism has been eliminated from what it would seem for Bishop Diggle is the only sacrament. Of Baptism the Dean of Ripon writes that it

was an ordinance of the Jews; proselytes, Essenes, the disciples of John were baptized. It was held that all Israel had undergone baptism at Sinai, and that therefore their children did not need it. Our Lord, no doubt, allowed its use in the formation of that which was at the time a new Jewish sect, but the tradition, if not the record itself, says, significantly that "Jesus baptized not, but His disciples." And St. Paul, though he uses the symbolism of baptism to enforce the renunciation and faith needed in Christians, yet marks emphatically the superiority of his office as a proclaimer of the Gospel over that of the administrator of the sacrament. (p. 92.)

And the author has the temerity to quote 1 Cor. i. 13—17 in support of his statement. Of course, in that passage St. Paul expressly states that the reason why he did not ordinarily baptize was that his Corinthian neophytes might not infer that they were "baptized in the name of Paul." Dean Freemantle makes no mention of the significant words of our Lord to Nicodemus: "Unless a man be born again," &c., any more than he makes mention, when he is dealing with the Lord's Supper, of those other equally significant words: "Unless you eat of the flesh of the Son of Man," &c. We are given to understand that both our Lord and St. Paul treated the sacraments as among the class of "inseparable accidents," that is, "things which necessarily accompany ideas in order to give them visible embodiment, but are only to be esteemed as helps to our consciousness of the mental or spiritual reality." And so, it is only "a strange thing" when any believer refuses the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. However, it apparently does not much matter, since the writer is able to point triumphantly to the instance of the Quakers and that of others with which he is acquainted "in which very earnest and capable men have felt that they served God better by abstaining than by partaking of an ordinance which had been so much denaturalized"! (p. 93.)

This work of Dean Freemantle's, like half a dozen others that have recently been published, affords abundant evidence of such naturalistic interpretations of Christian dogma.

"God," we are told, is "the eternal Energy" by which the world moves, whence, He "is in the highest degree Natural." No special revelation from above is required, since "revelation is itself eminently natural." (p. 4.) Neither is there any need to postulate a higher life, since "it is the higher life which is natural." (p. 3.) Nay, the Incarnation itself is natural, since, if Christ is "the Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," it follows, so argues Dean Freemantle, that "the Incarnation is the highest point of a process which is in its very essence natural." (p. 27.)

After this it is not surprising to find the writer affirming the "human personality" of our Lord, and deriving whatever divinity He may be held to possess from His "moral supremacy," though it is allowed that "He was not merely a very good man;" but the only proof of the statement that is offered is contained in the words: "We all feel that it is so." (p. 10.)

This, surely, is that "flabby Protestantism" which, having made terms with Pelagianism, now does the same with Arianism and Nestorianism.

It must have been somewhat pathetic to hear Lord William Cecil pleading at the recent Church Congress for unity of doctrine among the foreign missionaries, either on the basis of the Nicene or the Apostles' Creed, or none at all. The significance of such an appeal becomes apparent when we find that neither of these creeds satisfies the minds of many Anglicans at the present day. The Apostles' Creed, though "it gives us Bible facts," yet it does so "without showing their moral and spiritual importance;" and while the Nicene "is the creed of the Greek philosopher," the Athanasian is that of "the Latin logician." (p. 48.) Is not this the natural and necessary development of the principle enunciated by Bishop Gore, "of the supremacy of the Scriptures as the testing ground of doctrine"?¹

From the time when these latitudinarian Christians began to explain away the doctrine of "the Fall," it was inevitable that supernaturalism must eventually go with it. For if man has not fallen from a supernatural state, "Redemption" loses its meaning; it is not the divinely appointed means by which man should be restored to God's favour and re-acquire his lost sonship and inheritance.

According to Dean Freemantle, so far from being a fall, "it implies a step *upwards* in human development, especially by the

¹ *Orders and Unity*, p. 196.

consciousness of good and evil." (p. 162.) What may be the nature of this evil is not so clear, since "sin is degradation, an act of atavism, which falls backwards into animalism instead of rising to glory and honour; an act of selfishness which narrows us, instead of the expansion by which we attain to universal love." (p. 82.) In a word, so far from being a personal offence against God, it is some defect of our nature. There is therefore no need of sanctifying grace to effect that change in the soul by which it becomes restored to God's favour. Indeed, the term "grace" is not required to be mentioned in a treatise which would cast the whole of the theology of St. Augustine to the winds. Of course it follows that the punishment of sin is minimized. Enough that "it has become unbelievable to all who can say that God is our Father and that His name is Love, and to all who feel that a just and holy God cannot deal with His creatures in a manner which every good man in the world would condemn." (p. 159.) But let Dean Freemantle consider the huge mass of evil, physical and moral, before his eyes at the present day, or described in the pages of history, and in the face of it let him attempt the same argument, and he will find it difficult to sustain.

Surely the introduction of all this naturalism into Christian theology is a very clear illustration of the low level which Anglican theology has reached; nor can it be reassuring to those who have at heart the welfare of Christianity in this country that such flimsy apologetics should be written by clergymen holding responsible positions in the Anglican Church. High Churchmen may from time to time make their voices heard, but their protests are unheeded, and Naturalism goes on eating its way into the core of Anglicanism. Those who have discarded the supernatural know that they have the right to be considered as good Anglicans as High Churchmen themselves, and that they may rise to a position where they may enforce their views with such authority as a Bishop possesses, and by such moral influence as may attach to his example.

To us it is passing strange that any Christian should be content with, and should even wax enthusiastic about, such a minimum of religion as this Naturalism involves. These apologists still hold presumably that a supernatural end in the Vision of God is possible to man, but by what right do they eliminate the supernatural means divinely ordered to the attainment of that end? Or do they suppose that man can attain

that end by spending his life in the response, mediate or immediate, to the two primitive instincts common to man and the rest of the animal kingdom alike? And it is worth remembering that a mere animal may be, and often is, loving, self-sacrificing, generous; and can it be said therefore that Heaven is to be attained simply by the practice of such virtues? Honesty too, even the honesty of the robust Englishman which Dean Freemantle, arguing against Cardinal Newman, admires so much when contrasted with the supernaturalism of the "whining Italian beggar," need have no other sanction than that of our well-being here below, while the Italian beggar, whether whining or not, in so far as his life is supernatural will perform during the day a hundred acts which are ordered, either immediately or remotely, to union with God. Nor is morality secure without the safeguard of supernatural religion, just as our physical well-being is not secure without the safeguard of the moral law. To say this is no more to hold that the supernatural is the means and morality the end, than it is to reduce morality to the subservient position of a means to the physical or animal life. The physical life is of a lower order than the moral, just as the moral is of a lower order than that supernatural life which must be begun here that it may continue into the world to come. And as the physical life is unimportant as compared with the moral—a fact which is proved over and over again by the hero who throws it away that he may do something better than preserve it, so the positive function of morality is to serve as a foundation on which the supernatural may be raised.

Probably there never was a time when the need of supernatural religion, even as affording a rule of conduct, (which after all is not its chief function), was greater than at present. That need is in direct ratio to the advance of civilization. Stoicism as a system of ethics might have saved the Roman Empire, as indeed it might save these modern western nations, but the sanctions of Christianity are needed to enforce principles of self-abnegation sufficiently to resist the deteriorating influences of modern civilization. For that the Christianity of Christ is required. "Naturalized" Christianity is useless. "Christian worship and beneficence," in the words of Dean Freemantle, "becoming natural, blending with the development of human society," may be all very well in theory, but in practice such a Christianity is but little better than the

paganism of ancient Rome, and it will no more stand the storm and stress of modern, than Stoicism was able to withstand the prosperity of ancient, civilization. To bring down Christianity to the level of the natural is to pit it unarmed against the natural forces of the world and ultimately to court defeat. The Bishop of Carlisle may deprecate what he calls a "mere church-going Christianity," but after all, it is this church-going which fosters supernaturalism. No one would contend for a *mere* church-going Christianity, but to palliate the refusal to attend church is to bring about the non-observance of the moral law as well. "If Christianity was real in this country," said the Bishop in a sermon preached at the re-opening of Threlkeld church two or three months ago, "instead of being so often sheer hypocrisy, we should hear nothing about breaches of promise, nothing about divorce-court proceedings, cruel husbands, and faithless wives." But surely the Bishop knows that to frequent church, where presumably there are instructive and edifying sermons, is to provide one of the best means for the observance of the moral law, and if, as he seems to imply, there is a fairly general non-observance of that law, will not the suggestion be made that he must look nearer home for the cause? We need not disagree with the words of the Bishop of London at the recent Church Congress denying that "anyone who does not come regularly to our church is therefore irreligious," to be able to agree with the comment of a leader in the *Times* on "a complacency which has been fatal to the most glorious of institutions." Even supposing that here and there a man of upright character and excellent morals may be found who never goes near a church, it is none the less true that it is an excellent help for morality, while for the practice of supernatural religion it is almost a necessity, especially for those who come into closer contact with the deteriorating effects of merely material civilization.

It is not very difficult to trace the line of Anglicanism's advance. The principles laid down by the Reformers are in our own time being developed to their logical issue by the authors of *Supernatural Religion*, *Natural Religion*, *Natural Christianity*, to say nothing of these eight writers, the publication of whose "advanced" views has recently been deprecated by an Anglican Bishop. It will require much more than the pleadings of the President of the Church Congress, to secure a general acceptance of the dogma of the Resurrection. The views are too

widespread of those who hold that "the faith of eighteen centuries is vain," and that the fundamental statement, upon which, avowedly, its whole system is built, is itself untrue, or else "St. Paul speaking in his most prophetic tone with unusual emphasis and with the most deliberate solemnity was mistaken."¹

It is because such views are widespread and are daily gaining ground even among those in high places that the Anglican journal above referred to wrote :

For our part we prefer the new school of out-spoken dissentients from the faith once committed to the saints to the divines who from the safe entrenchment of cathedral closes and professorial chairs have so long been whittling the Catholic Faith away. One describes the relation of the Son to the Father as a merely ethical sonship and says that the difference between Christ and "other men" is that the spirit dwelt in Him uniquely. Another spells the pronoun of God the Father with a capital, and that of God the Son with a small letter. Another writes a preface to a Unitarian work on the Atonement. Another says that in the scriptural narrative of the Bible we are evidently in the circle of pagan ideas. Yet another denies that there is to be any second coming. What should the Church do in these circumstances of defection from the Gospel teaching?²

In all sincerity we say it—there is nothing for her but to retrace her steps.

¹ *Natural Religion*, p. 293.

² *Church Times*, August 11, 1911.

The Education of the Domiciled Community in India.

[COMMUNICATED.]

THE Domiciled Community in India is a phrase which is used to denote all those persons of pure or mixed European descent who have made India their home. The vast majority are of mixed descent, and are commonly called Eurasians. Eurasians and pure Europeans alike look to Europe for their religion and their civilization, however long their families may have lived in India. The existence of such a colony is a necessary consequence of European dominion. Wealthy Europeans, whether engaged in trade or employed in the services, always send their children home to be educated, and many, if not most, of these children never return to the East. The poorer classes of Europeans, however, cannot afford to send their children to Europe. Many of them settle down in India, and they and their descendants continue to swell the ranks of the Domiciled Community.

There is still a large field for the employment of the descendants of Europeans in the Government offices, the railways, the European workshops, and the various trades, which are financed and controlled by Europeans. The competition even for the smallest posts is, however, very keen, and Indians, whose standard of living is very low, are always available to fill them at very small salaries. European employers who are willing to help the Eurasian community complain that Eurasian candidates frequently do not possess the necessary educational qualifications. Among Indians the standard of education is continually rising, while among the Eurasians and domiciled Europeans it is either stationary or declining. Matters appear to have gone from bad to worse in this respect, and recent inquiries have elicited the fact that large numbers of the lower ranks of the domiciled are to be found among the dregs of the

Indian community in all the large cities. This is a sufficiently serious state of affairs, which is far from conducive to the prestige of Western civilization in India. The education of the children of the Domiciled Community has always been a subject of anxiety to the Government of India ; but it is every day becoming clearer that State assistance is now inadequate to the needs of the case, and that it must be supplemented by private benevolence. Hindu Rajas and Mahomedan Princes cannot be expected to come to the rescue of Christians ; and, as few of the Domiciled Community possess any large share of wealth, the necessary assistance must, therefore, be sought in Europe or America.

Recently the Anglican and Nonconformist churches in India have taken the question of education in hand, and have inaugurated a scheme to raise a sum of £250,000, with the object of improving the facilities available for the education of the Community. It is not proposed to interfere with the denominational character of the Christian schools in India, but to create a general fund, which shall be administered by a joint committee of the co-operating religious bodies. The joint committee is composed of representatives of the managers of the Church of England schools, and representatives of the non-Roman Catholic Christian schools in India. An influential committee, including the three Anglican Archbishops, the heads of the Nonconformist Churches, and several Anglo-Indian administrators has been formed in Great Britain to help the movement ; the Anglican Bishops are also co-operating. Each Bishop has nominated a Diocesan Secretary of the fund, and an appeal is being issued to the public for subscriptions by the secretaries. By these means it is hoped that the required amount will be raised during the autumn and winter. The keynote of the enterprise is described by the Bishop of Calcutta as "co-operation without compromise." So far as the objects of the promoters of the fund are at present apparent, the proceeds will in the first place be devoted to improving the salaries and prospects of the teachers, many of whom, it is said, are insufficiently paid, and it seems probable that trained teachers will be brought out from England with the object of raising the status of the schools.

Any scheme to help the descendants of our kith and kin in India will, no doubt, commend itself to the public, but the spirit in which some at least of the supporters of the present

scheme appear to be entering into the enterprise is much to be deprecated.

In an article which was published in the May number of the *Nineteenth Century*, the author, Mr. Skipton, after describing the necessity and the objects of the proposed scheme, contended that the Government of India have hitherto failed in their duty, that they ought to bear a larger proportion of the cost of educating the children of the Community, and that the result of this neglect and the inability of the non-Roman Catholic bodies to provide suitable schools, within the reach of the poorer classes, has been to drive large numbers of the Eurasian Community towards the Roman Catholic Church, and thus to create grave political dangers.

The suggestion that the Government of India should be primarily responsible for the education of the Domiciled Community appears to rest on a misconception of the correct attitude of the supreme government towards all such questions.

In the Proclamation to the Princes, Chiefs, and People of India, which was read in the principal cities in November, 1858, it was declared "that none shall be in any wise *favoured*, none molested or disquieted by reason of their religious faith and observances, but that all shall enjoy alike the equal and impartial protection of the laws." In education, as in all matters, the Government of India and the various local governments are bound by this declaration. It is quite impossible for them to create and finance the special State schools which would be required for the higher education of the children of the small Domiciled Community, while millions of the indigenous native population are hardly supplied with elementary schools, and the better classes of Indians are clamouring for further educational extension. After all, the Domiciled Community numbers only about two hundred and fifty thousand among a population of over three hundred millions. Mr. Skipton says that less than one-fifth of the cost of the education of the Eurasian children—for all practical purposes the Eurasians and the Domiciled Community are synonymous—is paid for by Government. The average cost of the special education of each Eurasian child is, however, so much higher than the cost of the education of the pure Indian that it is safe to assert that the Government of India contribute a larger sum than the members of the Domiciled Community would be entitled to, on the basis either of their numbers or their taxable capacity. Besides, the children are, of

course, free to attend the Indian schools and to enjoy the same facilities as the rest of the population. I do not say that this latter education is suited to their needs; but it must never be forgotten that the Government of India cannot show favour to the Domiciled Community, on the ground of race or religious belief, and the revenues of India cannot be reasonably expected to bear more than a strict proportion of the cost of any special facilities which may be required. It follows, therefore, that if European missionaries in India desire special educational facilities for this class, they must either find the major portion of the means, or the Domiciled Community must supply them. This is undoubtedly unfortunate, considering the impoverished condition of the majority of Eurasians, but it is a necessary consequence of that strict impartiality which we in justice must observe in dealing with all the varied and numerous races who inhabit the Indian peninsula. As stated above, I sympathize with every effort which may be made to improve the educational facilities open to the members of the poor Eurasian community, but, unfortunately, Mr. Skipton has not contented himself with portraying their exceptional needs. Though he pays a tribute to the educational work effected in India by the Roman Catholic Church, his article appears to furnish clear proofs of the existence of a bias, which will not appeal to the majority of secular readers either in India or at home.

He is obsessed with the idea that the Roman Catholics intend to capture the whole Eurasian community, and he dreads the political effects.

The Roman Church in India is [he says] an alien church, manned and directed by French, Belgian, Italian and German clergy, with a sprinkling of Irish Roman Catholics, none of whom—and the last named, unfortunately, least of all—can be reckoned as our friends politically or otherwise. The part that a population thus trained will take in the day of trouble will depend on the direction they get from their spiritual pastors, upon whom the fate of India might thus come to depend.

To anyone at all remotely acquainted with the facts this is an extraordinary statement. The "Roman Church" has been in India for centuries. There are roughly three million Christians in the country, of whom 2,660,000 are native Christians. Of these two-fifths are Roman Catholics, and only one-ninth are Anglicans. The Uniat and Jacobite Syrians, another "alien"

Church, account for another one-fifth. The whole Christian community would reasonably be expected to take the side of the British in case of internal commotion, and they have always done so in the past.

The Domiciled Community does not number more than one-tenth of the total. Mr. Skipton does not advert to the fact that about one half, possibly more, of the Eurasian population are descended on one side from the French and Portuguese soldiers and settlers, who tried to found an Empire in India. The great majority of these are, of course, Roman Catholics. The question of religion is, however, quite immaterial, as far as political effects are concerned. All Eurasians are united in their loyalty to the British "raj," and it is impossible to conceive any circumstances which would estrange that loyalty. It is notorious that the inhabitants of Portuguese Goa, nearly all of whom are Roman Catholics, would not be adverse to the inclusion of their territory in British India. The Catholic clergy, it is true, are, for the most part foreigners, Belgians, French, and Italians. But how this fact can affect adversely the interests of the British Empire in India it is also difficult to conceive.

It is well known that these clergy have no grievances against the British "raj," and many of them state openly that they in fact receive more favourable treatment than they could expect in their own countries. The interests, in fact, of all Europeans in India, of whatever nationality, are inextricably bound up with the maintenance of British dominion. Whatever political, religious or social differences may exist, there is complete unanimity on this issue. Mr. Skipton makes a special reference to the Irish; but the argument ignores the notorious fact that the Irish of all classes, resident in India, have ever been the most loyal supporters of the Government. It could not be otherwise. Mr. Skipton does not advert to the fact that there is a sprinkling of English, as well as Irish priests, to be found among the Roman Catholic clergy; nor to the fact that there are several Protestant churches manned by foreigners in the country. In Bengal, for instance, there is a powerful, well-organized German Lutheran mission, which numbers about 100,000 adherents. It is manned by Germans and controlled by a Curatorium from Berlin. Is this another political danger? The existence of a German Lutheran clergy, recruited from North Germany, would *prima facie* appear to be a greater source of potential danger than the cosmopolitan clergy of the Roman Catholic Church.

The fact is, however, that no political danger whatsoever is apparent. The German missionaries, as well as all the others, are busy developing their missionary and educational work, and they appreciate the fact that they would be amongst the first to suffer, as they did in 1857, in case of a mutiny of the Indian soldiery or a rising of any section of the Indian people. Mr. Skipton quoted Sir Andrew Fraser, a former Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, and an able and experienced official, in support of his theory. Sir Andrew has made public his views on European education in India in the October number of the *Contemporary Review*. While supporting strongly the scheme for improving the status of the Protestant schools and colleges on grounds of humanity and imperial considerations, he makes no reference whatsoever to the alleged political dangers foreshadowed by Mr. Skipton. Quite the contrary.

The Church of Rome [he writes] alone has grappled at all adequately with the problem for its own community. . . . One is bound to acknowledge the debt which India owes to those who from Christian motives have given themselves to this work.

The vast majority of English and Scotch residents in India, who may be expected to have some knowledge of political conditions, view the work of the Catholic clergy in a very different light to Mr. Skipton. When the late Catholic Archbishop of Calcutta, the Right Rev. Dr. Goethals, died some years ago, a movement was set on foot to commemorate his long connection with Calcutta. A considerable sum was subscribed, a large percentage of which, if not the greater part, was freely contributed by non-Catholics. The proceeds were utilized to found a school at Kurseong, manned by the Irish Christian Brothers, who now afford an excellent, cheap, and healthy education to the children of the poorer members of the Domiciled Community. If the English or Scotch residents, who subscribed, scented any political dangers, is it likely that they would have opened their purse-strings?

The political effects of Christianity on the Indian people was signally exemplified during the Mutiny. The Madras Sepoy regiments, in which there was a considerable sprinkling of Christians, Roman Catholics for the most part, were hardly, if at all, affected by the mutinous spirit of the Indian soldiery, and the fact was rightly attributed to the presence of a strong Christian element in the ranks. So much for the political dangers.

The spirit underlying a great deal of Mr. Skipton's writing is also shown by his remark that "with the coming of a Roman Catholic Viceroy to India in 1880 . . . the Roman Catholic missions in India definitely started upon a great forward movement." It is, therefore, politically dangerous to send a Roman Catholic Viceroy to India! Lord Ripon did, indeed, create a scare in India by his concessions to Indian opinion, concessions which have been since far exceeded, but he provoked in the process the hostility of almost the whole European community, Roman Catholics as well as Protestants. It is difficult to conceive how a Roman Catholic Viceroy, who is pledged to favour no creed, and who, as the representative of the Crown, must be specially discreet, could even unconsciously influence the propagation of Catholicity in India. If there were any truth in Mr. Skipton's suggestion, the fact that most of the Viceroys have been members of the Church of England must have been a powerful asset in the propagation of Anglican beliefs, and yet everybody knows that this is not the case. The extension of the Catholic system of schools and missions since 1880 has been chiefly noticeable in Bengal, and the causes are not in the remotest degree connected with Lord Ripon's Viceroyalty. The extension of the Bengal Catholic missions is, as might be expected, mainly the work of the Jesuits, and they were attracted to the country in large numbers by the prospect of Christianizing the aboriginal races. Their success in mission work has been mainly confined to the areas inhabited by the non-Aryan races, viz., the Chota Nagpur uplands. In 1886 there were only 3,000 Catholic Christians in this area. The missionaries themselves estimate that the number of baptized Catholic Christians and catechumens is now little short of 150,000. This rapid expansion necessitated the establishment of large central institutions in the plains and in the hills. The institution in the hills is almost as necessary to the missionary working in the plains as his daily bread. Thither he repairs when his health is enfeebled by the heat of the plains, and returns to his labours after an interval refreshed and re-invigorated by the bracing climate of the Himalayas. The members of the Order stationed in the hills are not idle. They employ their time teaching the children of the Eurasians, and even of the Europeans. There is no loss of efficiency, no waste of time, and the dislocation of work involved by frequent journeys to Europe is avoided. The hill seminary is also a

training ground for the young priest before he undertakes mission work in the plains. The combination of all these functions under the control of authorities who are remarkable for their powers of organization, makes for the maximum of efficiency. I should also note that the Catholic clergy come to India generally with the intention of sticking to their appointed tasks to the end, and this they almost invariably do. The two elements which, therefore, lead to their success, are superior organization and an unfailing stream of human material ready to sacrifice everything to what they believe to be the highest of all causes. It is extremely doubtful whether the Catholics expend in proportion as much money on their schools in India as does the Anglican communion. It is certain, however, that they are better organized, and that the teaching afforded in their schools is at least as good, while it is generally much cheaper. An opinion appears to have gone abroad that the Roman Catholic authorities in India have definitely declined to take any part in the scheme for the re-organization of the schools and the collection of the necessary fund. This opinion is incorrect. The Right Rev. Dr. Aelen, Catholic Archbishop of Madras, has made this clear in an article on European Education in India, which was published in the *Tablet* of the 24th June last.

As a matter of fact [he writes] I may say that personally I was never approached in the matter, though in the arch-diocese of Madras, of which I have the honour to be Archbishop, a very large proportion of the Eurasian community are my spiritual subjects. Indeed, it would seem safe to say that the Catholic body has not been consulted at all.

From the issue of the *Catholic Herald of India*, dated May 17, 1911, it also appears that "the Catholics have not been consulted."

The net result, as Dr. Aelen points out, is that the Catholics will have no share in the benefits to be derived from the fund, although about sixty per cent. of the Eurasian and European pupils attend their schools. The situation is, therefore, sufficiently serious. The Catholic authorities will have to face increased competition at a time when they find it difficult to provide for the ever-increasing demands of their missions and orphanages. In Madras, for instance, funds are at present required by the Archbishop to increase the accommodation of one of the boys' orphanages known as the Adyar Orphanage. In the province of Bengal, over 100,000 native

Christians have been added to the Catholic fold within the last thirty years, and it is necessary to provide churches and efficient elementary schools for this large community. Hitherto, the bulk of the funds for Catholic missions and schools, has come from the continent of Europe. Is it too much to ask that the Catholics of the British Empire, who number twelve or thirteen millions, will now come to the rescue of the zealous Catholic missionaries in their efforts to increase the number and the efficiency of the schools, which exist mainly for the benefit of their kith and kin, the descendants of Europeans in India? Such support would be the most practical way of acknowledging the success which has so far admittedly attended their efforts on behalf of their own community. About half the members of the Domiciled Community are Catholics, and their children will in any event continue to attend the Catholic schools. However successful the promoters of the present non-Catholic scheme of reorganization may be, their success will not solve the problem of European and Eurasian education in India. The *Times*, in a leading article on the subject,¹ welcoming the signs of inter-denominational co-operation among the various Protestant bodies, expressed the view that the scheme is "full of promise" even without the Catholics. A scheme which embraces only half or less than half of the whole community is at least singularly incomplete. With all due respect to the *Times*, a widespread opinion appears to prevail in India, at all events, even among Protestants, the men on the spot, that the Catholic system of education has been always distinguished by better organization than that of its rivals, and that the prospects of the scheme are not so roseate as is anticipated in some quarters. In support of this view, I may quote the following extract from the Calcutta newspaper, *Capital*, the organ of the European commercial and industrial classes in Western India:

In the past money has been given to Protestant institutions by the State and by private individuals, some of the most generous of the latter being Roman Catholics, but there is little to show for it. The modern evangelists, if they are to succeed as well as they hope, will have to see to it that history does not repeat itself.

Statistics are not available to show the exact percentage of non-Roman Catholic pupils who attend the Catholic schools for Europeans and Eurasians. It is unlikely, however, that they ever exceed twenty or twenty-five per cent. of the

¹ April 18, 1911.

total number of attendants. The attitude of the Catholic authorities on the subject is fully explained in an extract from the *Bombay Examiner* published in the *Tablet* of August 26th last.

It is only under a regrettable necessity [says the *Examiner*] that we open our schools to outsiders. But the circumstances in this country are such that in order to run schools on a large and efficient scale we are forced to take a wider range, and admit promiscuously both Protestants and non-Christians. In doing so, we are obliged in point of honour and public confidence not to take advantage of the trust reposed in us, not to interfere with the religious convictions of those committed to our care on that tacit understanding. We are forced to the policy of abstention not only on grounds of honour, but also on grounds of expediency.

The Domiciled Community numbers only about one in every 1,300 of the total population, a mere drop in the ocean. Its members are scattered over the length and breadth of India. For this reason alone it seems probable that numerous non-Roman Catholic European and Eurasian pupils will continue to seek admission to the advantages of the Catholic schools. In view of the peculiar conditions, on grounds of humanity, and also in view of the fact that Protestants frequently render substantial help to the Catholic missions and schools, it seems clear that these children should be refused admission to the advantages of the schools only on very exceptional grounds, and their parents should have absolute guarantees against any interference with their religious beliefs.

There is one other point to which I venture to direct attention. If Eurasians and Europeans are to be fitted for employment in India, a sound education in English is essential; and, as such an education can only be imparted by English-speaking teachers, the managers of Roman Catholic schools should endeavour to procure an efficient staff of teachers of British nationality. At least one such teacher should be attached to every large school. Something has been done already in this respect, but more is required. The Jesuit Fathers of St. Joseph's College, Trichinopoly, have already brought out a number of teachers of British nationality for educational purposes. The French Fathers of Bangalore have also sent some of their members to take their degrees at Cambridge and London, but the Archdiocese of Madras, which has a large Eurasian population, has, it is said, not a single Englishman on the teaching staff of the city schools.

"X."

The Spiritual Testament of John Shakespeare.

IN an article contributed to the pages of *THE MONTH*, in May, 1882, and consequently close on thirty years ago, the present writer made some attempt to discuss the external evidence bearing upon the question of Shakespeare's alleged *Catholicism*. Occupying a foremost place in that evidence is a curious document which, if authentic, would serve to prove beyond all doubt that the poet's father, John Shakespeare, remained to the end a staunch adherent of the old religion. That this profession of faith is absolutely authentic, was always maintained by the distinguished Shakespeare scholar, Mr. Richard Simpson,¹ and his views have been warmly seconded of late years by Father H. S. Bowden,² Mr. W. S. Lilly³ and others. On the other hand the students of Elizabethan literature who are looked upon as most representative of up-to-date criticism, hardly allow themselves to bestow even a passing word on this spiritual testament of Shakespeare's father. It is, Sir Sidney Lee curtly tells us, a forgery, and it constitutes the most important achievement of John Jordan, a resident at Stratford-on-Avon, whom he further describes as "the earliest Shakesperean forger to achieve notoriety." It has always struck me as curious that this disputed document, which, tedious and wordy as it is, has an interesting bearing upon the devotional life of Catholics under the penal laws, should never have been more seriously studied, and having recently, in preparing a short article upon the religion of Shakespeare for the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, had occasion to examine the question again, I have been tempted to set down the result of my inquiries in some detail. I cannot but believe that if Sir Sidney Lee and his sympathizers will fairly reconsider the question they will see

¹ *The Rambler*, April, 1858, pp. 245 seq.

² *The Religion of Shakespeare* (chiefly from the writings of the late Mr. Richard Simpson), pp. 85—91, London, 1899.

³ *Studies in Religion and Literature*, pp. 1—30, London, 1904.

reason to modify, if not entirely to revoke, the judgment previously pronounced.

And perhaps it may be well to premise that I consider the question of John Shakespeare's will to have only a slight and indirect bearing upon the question of the poet's religion. Given the known facts of his life it seems impossible to believe that William Shakespeare was himself a practical Catholic. No doubt he had great sympathy with much that seemed to him beautiful in the older religion. This is what we should expect of one whose mother belonged to a staunch Catholic stock, and who came from a part of the country which was quite a hotbed of recusancy. Without any such ties of family or early associations, many an agnostic of our own day has written in a spirit of warm appreciation for Catholic doctrine and practice. May I add that so far as Shakespeare's true mind penetrates through the disguises imposed by his dramas and sonnets, it seems to me the mind of one who was tainted, if not deeply imbued, with the infidelity which, as we know from many sources, was rampant in the more Bohemian circles of London society during the Elizabethan period. But in any case the religious opinions of the poet's father have some interest of their own, and long as it is I venture to set before the reader the full text of the document which purports to be the spiritual testament of John Shakespeare. For a reason which will be explained below I have enclosed the first portion of the paper in square brackets.

I.

[In the name of God, the father, sonne, and holy ghost, the most holy and blessed Virgin Mary, mother of God, the holy host of arch-angels, angels, patriarchs, prophets, evangelists, apostles, saints, martyrs and all the celestial court and company of heaven, I John Shakspear, an unworthy member of the holy Catholick religion, being at this my present writing in perfect health of body and sound mind, memory and understanding, but calling to mind the uncertainty of life and certainty of death, and that I may possibly be cut off in the blossome of my sins and called to render an account of all my transgressions externally and internally, and that I may be unprepared for the dreadful trial either by sacrament, pennance, fasting or prayer, or any other purgation whatever, do in the holy presence above specified of my own free and voluntary accord, make and ordaine this my last spiritual will, testament, confession, protestation and confession of faith, hopinge hereby to receive pardon for all my sinnes and offences and thereby to be made partaker of life everlasting, through the only

merits of Jesus Christ my saviour and redeemer who took upon himself the likeness of man, suffered death and was crucified upon the crosse for the redemption of sinners.

II.

Item. I John Shakspear doe by this present protest, acknowledge and confess that in my past life I have been a most abominable and grievous sinner and therefore unworthy to be forgiven without a true and sincere repentance for the same. But trusting in the manifold mercies of my blessed Saviour and Redeemer, I am encouraged by relying on his sacred word, to hope for salvation and to be made partaker of his heavenly kingdom, as a member of the celestial company of angels, saints and martyrs there to reside for ever and ever in the court of my God.

III.

Item. I John Shakspear doe by this present protest and declare, that as I am certain I must passe out of this transitory life into another that will last to eternity, I do hereby most humbly implore and intreat my good and guardian angell to instruct me in this my solemn preparation, protestation and confession of faith] at least spiritually in will adoring and most humbly beseeching my saviour that he will be pleased to assist me in so dangerous a voyage, to defend me from the snares and deceites of my infernall enemies and to conduct me to the secure haven of his eternall blisse.

IV.

Item. I John Shakspear doe protest that I will also passe out of this life, armed with the last sacrament of extreme unction, the which if through any let or hindrance I should not then be able to have, I doe now also for that time demand and crave the same; beseeching his divine majesty that he will be pleased to anoynt my senses both internall and externall with the sacred oyle of his infinite mercy and to pardon me all my sins committed by seeing, speaking, feeling,¹ smelling, hearing, touching or by any other way whatsoever.

V.

Item. I John Shakspear doe by this present protest that I will never through any temptation whatsoever despaire of the divine goodness, for the multitude and greatness of my sinnes; for which although I confesse that I have deserved hell, yet will I stedfastly hope in God's infinite mercy, knowing that he hath heretofore pardoned many as great sinners as myself, whereof I have good warrant sealed with his sacred mouth, in holy writ, whereby he pronounceth that he is not come to call the just but sinners.

¹ Another copy reads "justing," as will be explained below.

VI.

Item. I John Shakspear do protest that I do not know that I have ever done any good worke meritorious of life everlasting : and if I have done any I do acknowledge that I have done it with a great deale of negligence and imperfection, neither should I have been able to have done the least without the assistance of his divine grace. Wherefore let the devill remain confounded, for I doe in no wise presume to merit heaven by such good workes alone, but through the merits and blood of my lord and saviour, jesus, shed upon the crose for me most miserable sinner.

VII.

Item. I John Shakspear do protest by this present writing that I will patiently endure and suffer all kind of infirmity, sickness, yea and the paine of death itself, wherein if it should happen, which God forbid, that through violence of paine and agony or by subtilty of the devill I should fall into any impatience or temptation of blasphemy or murmuration against God, or the catholik faith, or give any signe of bad example, I do henceforth and for that present repent me, and I am most heartily sorry for the same, and I do renounce all the evill whatsoever which I might have then done or said, beseeching his divine clemency that he will not forsake me in that grievous and painefull agony.

VIII.

Item. I John Shakspear, by virtue of this present testament I do pardon all the injuries and offences that any one hath ever done unto me, either in my reputation, life, goods or any other way whatsoever ; beseeching sweet jesus to pardon them for the same ; and I do desire that they will doe the like by me, whom I have offended or injured in any sort howsoever.

IX.

Item. I John Shakspear do heere protest that I do render infinite thanks to his divine majesty for all the benefits that I have received as well secret as manifest and in particular, for the benefit of my Creation, Redemption, Sanctification, Conservation and Vocation to the holy knowledge of him and his true Catholike faith ; but above all for his so great expectation of me to pennance, when he might most justly have taken me out of this life when I least thought of it, yea even then when I was plunged in the dirty puddle of my sinnes. Blessed be therefore and praised, for ever and ever, his infinite patience and charity.

X.

Item. I John Shakspear do protest that I am willing, yea I do infinitely desire and humbly crave, that of this my last will and testa-

ment, the glorious and ever Virgin mary, mother of god, refuge and advocate of sinners, whom I honour specially above all other saints, may be the chiefe Executresse together with those other saints my patrons (Saint Winefride) all whom I invoke and beseech to be present at the hour of my death that she and they may comfort me with their desired presence and crave of sweet jesus that he will receive my soul into peace.

XI.

Item in virtue of this present writing I John Shakspear do likewise most willingly and with all humility constitute and ordaine my good Angel, for Defender and Protectone of my soul in the dreadfull day of Judgement, when the finall sentence of eternall life or death shall be discussed and given, beseeching him that as my soule was appointed to his custody and protection when I lived, even so he will vouchsafe to defend the same at that houre and conduct it to eternall bliss.

XII.

Item I John Shakspear do in like manner pray and beseech all my dear friends, parents and kinsfolks, by the bowels of our Saviour Jesus Christ that since it is uncertain what lot will befall me, for feere notwithstanding least by reason of my sinnes, I be to pass and stay a long while in purgatory, they will vouchsafe to assist and succour me with their holy prayers and satisfactory workes, especially with the holy sacrifice of the masse, as being the most effectuall meanes to deliver soules from their torments and paines; from the which if I shall by God's gracious goodnesse and by their vertuous workes be delivered, I do promise that I will not be ungratefull unto them, for so great a benefitt.

XIII.

Item I John Shakspear doe by this my last will and testament bequeath my soul as soon as it shall be delivered and loosened from the prison of this my body to be entombed in the sweet and amorous coffin of the side of Jesus Christ and that in this life-giveing sepulcher it may rest and live, perpetually inclosed in that eternall habitation of repose there to blesse for ever and ever that direfull iron of the launce which like a charge in a censure¹ formes so sweet and pleasant a monument within the sacred breast of my lord and saviour.

XIV.

Item lastly I John Shakspear doe protest that I will willingly accept of death in what manner soever it may befall me, conforming my will unto the will of God; accepting of the same in satisfaction for my sinnes and giving thanks unto his divine majesty for the life he hath bestowed upon me. And if it pleases him to prolong or shorten the

¹ There is another reading here which will be dealt with below.

same, blessed be he also a thousand thousand times ; into whose most holy hands I commend my soul and body, my life and death : and I beseech him above all things that he never permit any change to be made by me John Shakspear of this my aforesaid will and testament. Amen.

I John Shakspear have made this present writing of protestation confession and charter in presence of the blessed virgin mary, my Angell guardian, and all the Celestiall Court as witnesses hereunto, the which my meaning is that it be of full value now presently and for ever, with the force and vertue of testament, codicill and donation in cause of death ; confirming it anew, being in perfect health of soul and body and signed with mine own hand ; carrying also the same about me and for the better declaration hereof my will and intention is that it be finally buried with me after my death.

Pater noster, Ave Maria, Credo ; jesu, son of David, have mercy on me Amen.¹

This is the curious document first given to the world in 1790 in one of the introductory volumes of Edward Malone's edition of the plays. Malone was a kindly and a generous man, but not by any means uncritical or foolish. His first instinct, as we shall see, had been to regard the Testament with much suspicion. He had had it in his hands several months before he printed it, and had made it the subject of many questions in his correspondence with Stratford. There had been ample time to answer these questions, and the following statement, which was prefixed to the document, and finally sent to press in the early part of 1790, represents no hastily formed impression, but a judgment tested by careful inquiry.

About twenty years ago, one Mosely, a master-bricklayer, who usually worked with his men, being employed by Mr. Thomas Hart, the fifth descendant in a direct line from our poet's sister, Joan Hart, to new-tile the old house at Stratford in which Mr. Hart lives, and in which our poet was born, found a very extraordinary manuscript between the rafters and the tiling of the house. It is a small paper-book, consisting of five leaves stitched together. It had originally consisted of six leaves, but unluckily the first was wanting when the book was found. I have taken some pains to ascertain the authenticity of this manuscript, and after a very careful enquiry am perfectly satisfied that it is genuine.

The writer, John Shakspeare, calls it his Will, but it is rather a declaration of his faith and pious resolutions. Whether it contains the

¹ Malone, *Shakespeare's Works* (Ed. 1790), vol. ii. pp. 162—166, and 330, 331.

religious sentiments of our poet's father or *elder* brother, I am unable to determine. The handwriting is undoubtedly not so ancient as that *usually* written about the year 1600; but I have now before me a manuscript written by Alleyn the player at various times between 1599 and 1614, and another by Forde the dramattick poet in 1606, in nearly the same handwriting as that of the manuscript in question. The Rev. Mr. Davenport, Vicar of Stratford upon Avon, at my request endeavoured to find out Mr. Mosely, to examine more particularly concerning this manuscript, but he died about two years ago. His daughter however who is now living and Mr. Hart who is also living and now sixty years old, perfectly well remember the finding of this paper. Mosely some time after he had found it gave it to Mr. Payton an alderman of Stratford who obligingly transmitted it to me through the hands of Mr. Davenport. It is proper to observe that the finder of this relique bore the character of a very honest sober and industrious man and that he neither asked nor received any price for it and I may also add that its contents are such as no one could have thought of inventing with a view to literary imposition.

If the injunction contained in the latter part of it (that it should be buried with the writer) was observed, then must the paper which has thus fortuitously been recovered, have been a copy made from the original previous to the burial of John Shakspeare.

After commenting further on the absence of the first leaf of the document, Malone prints the portion which he had before him (vol. ii. pp. 162—166), but on a later page in the same volume among his "Emendations and Additions" he returns to the subject thus :

Since the sheet which contains the will of John Shakespeare was printed, I have learned that it was originally perfect when found by Joseph Mosely, though the first leaf has since been lost. Mosely transcribed a large portion of it, and from his copy I have been furnished with the introductory articles, for the want of which I was obliged to print this will in an imperfect state. They are as follows.

Here Malone supplies the omitted leaf from what was alleged to be a *copy* of the original manuscript found by Mosely. It is, of course, the portion printed above in square brackets, containing sections one and two and a part of section three. Now it will be noticed that these two portions of the testament rest on very different evidence. For the latter and larger part Malone had the original manuscript in his hands just as it was found. He never doubted its genuineness, though he suspected it to be of later date than 1601, the year John Shakespeare died. For

the communication of the MS. he was not indebted to John Jordan but to Mr. Payton, coach-builder and Alderman of Stratford, and to Dr. Davenport, the Vicar. On the other hand, the first leaf of the testament never reached Malone in its original form. He had to depend upon a copy which was furnished, as we shall see, by Jordan, and which apparently the latter pretended had originally been made by the bricklayer Mosely.

That the inquiries which Malone professes to have made were no mere pretence is proved by letters of his still extant. There is no reason to suppose that we have all his letters, and the replies he received have not apparently been preserved, but we have questions addressed by him to Dr. Davenport, and questions also sent to Jordan, the latter of whom it is clear he only half trusted.

And here perhaps it may be well to explain that John Jordan was a wheelwright of Stratford-on-Avon who had educated himself sufficiently to write poetry and to examine the records of Stratford and other neighbouring parishes in search of Shakespearean documents. Malone used him to copy entries in registers, and at a later period helped him financially. There is, however, no scrap of evidence that Jordan ever pretended to supply the *originals* of sixteenth or seventeenth century documents. If he were the unscrupulous person he is suspected of being, he would almost certainly have attempted this if he possessed the necessary skill in penmanship. Since it is Jordan who is denounced by Sir Sidney Lee and others as the forger of the John Shakespeare Testament, I would put it to Sir Sidney that it would surely be a fact without parallel in the history of such fabrications that an unscrupulous person, clever enough to produce a long seventeenth century document which completely imposed on a critic like Malone, should have allowed his talent to lie idle after this first triumph, more especially at a time when he was suffering from dire pecuniary necessity. It was Jordan, no doubt, who afterwards furnished the lost portion of the Testament, and who also furnished the continuation of the "lowsie Lucy" song, but in both these cases no caligraphic skill was needed. Malone saw nothing but what professed to be a recent copy. Hence I infer, not that Jordan was necessarily an honest investigator, but that he probably lacked the manual dexterity to execute a forgery, especially a forgery of over 2,000 words. For your forger loves

concise documents of great intrinsic interest, the very opposite of this dreary profession of faith which, as Malone rightly says, "no one could have thought of inventing with a view to literary imposition."

To return however to the critic's inquiries at Stratford-on-Avon. The following letter, addressed to Dr. Davenport, the Vicar, is entirely taken up with the question now before us. It was published with other letters by Mr. J. O. Halliwell in 1866.

London, Oct. 21, 1789.

Dear Sir

I have some doubts concerning the very curious paper you were so good as to transmit to me, which you may perhaps be able to dispel.

It appears to me that the handwriting is at least thirty years more modern than the year 1601, when John Shakspear, the father of our poet, died; and the spelling is in many places not sufficiently ancient: thus we frequently find the words *mercy*, *majesty*, &c. The name Shakespeare is written throughout with (*sic*; *lege* without) a final *e*, a practice which began to prevail in the middle of the last century, but of which I have not found a single instance before in any instrument whatsoever.

The pointing throughout is remarkably correct, but perhaps this may have been done by Mr. Payton or by you. It is very unlucky that the first leaf is lost, as in the first article we probably should have found a description of the occupation of the writer, and the time when it was drawn up. Is there the most remote chance of finding it now? Is Mosely the bricklayer yet living? How long had he this little relic in his possession before he gave it to Mr. Payton, and did he ask any price for it? Did Mr. Thomas Hart ever hear of it?

It is very remarkable that among the children of old John Shakespeare recorded in your register,² there is not one of the name of *John*. I have sometimes inclined to think that there was an elder son of that name, *born before the commencement of the register*, and if such a one there was, and he lived to the year 1630 or thereabouts, this paper might have been written by him and this would solve some of the difficulties which I have stated: yet to find a person so deeply tinged with popery at that late period, appointing the Blessed Virgin his executress appears strange also. If there ever was a younger John, he must have died I think before 1608.

I beg to know whether there is any tombstone within or without your church, that marks the place where John Shakespeare was buried.

¹ This must be a mistake of Mr. Halliwell the transcriber. Most of the early forms of the name have the final *e*, whereas in printing the spiritual will Malone follows his manuscript and omits it.

² Dr. Davenport had lent Malone the parish registers of Stratford. Malone had them in his keeping in London when this was written.

I have been able to make out the whole of the last leaf of this curious paper, in which the ink is very faint and some of the words almost obliterated except one line, concerning which I have some doubts. The passage is in the 13th article and runs thus: 'Here to blesse for ever and ever the direful iron of the launce which *like a charge in a censure* forms so sweet and pleasant a monument within the sacred breast of my lord and Saviour.'

The words underscored are those I doubt about. Are the contents of a censor called anywhere in the sacred writings its *charge*?

In the last article the writer desires that his will, as he calls it, may be buried with him; perhaps that request may have been complied with and this may have been a copy made previous to his interment. To investigate this would be curious.

I beg to know whether the numerals III., V., &c., prefixed to the articles were originally prefixed, or were added since?

Excuse all this trouble and believe me, dear sir,

Your very faithful and obedient servant,

EDMOND MALONE.

[P.S.] Among the present Aldermen of Stratford is there anyone that is a shopkeeper, or any of no higher an occupation than that of a butcher? You know my object in this enquiry.

I have this moment observed that in the 12th article he exhorts his *parents* to pray for him: another circumstance which leads us to a younger John.

Would it not be possible to ascertain by means of Mr. Hamond Lucy the age of Sir Thomas Lucy at his death. Pray be so good as to return my thanks to Mr. Payton.¹

I postpone for the moment any comments on these difficulties, in order to turn to some queries addressed by Malone to Jordan a few months later. It is clear that Jordan had meanwhile sent Malone a manuscript volume of Shakespearean notes, and in this was included what purported to be a complete copy of John Shakespeare's Testament. At this date, March 10, 1790, this imperfect text had apparently been printed off, but not the "Additions and Emendations" cited above. Writing to Jordan then, March 10, 1790, Malone says:

You have inserted a copy of the religious testament of John Shakespeare, whom I believe to have been the poet's eldest brother. The original of this was, some time ago, transmitted to me by Mr. Davenport, but the first leaf was wanting, containing the first two articles and part of the third, in consequence of which I have been obliged to

¹ *Davenport Correspondence*, pp. 45-47.

print it imperfect. On my writing to Stratford on this subject I understood that Mr. Hart said it wanted the first leaf *when originally found*; and Mr. Payton, I think, concurred in the same account. How, then, have you made a copy of the first two articles and part of the third? When was your copy made and from whom did you obtain the original? And did you some years ago send a copy of this paper to the printer of the *Gentleman's Magazine*?¹

The letter concludes with a question or two about the Lucy Song. Writing again to Jordan on March 25, 1790, Malone comes back to the same subject.

Sir. I received your packet safe by the coach, and request to know whether the first copy which you made of John Shakespeare's will, and which you have inserted in your small quarto book, was taken from the original found by Joseph Mosely, or from a copy made by him or any other person, and whether the leaf which Mosely gave you shortly before his death, containing the first and second articles, was of the same size, and written in the same manner with the rest. The few leaves which were sent to me were very small, tacked together by a thread; the size the eighth part of a sheet, and the upper part of the last page but one almost illegible.

When did Mosely first mention his having found this paper (I mean the will) to anyone?

Why should he ask you to lend him your copy to show Mr. Tomkins when he had himself the original?

Was the copy in your *book* made from that you gave Mr. Keating or from the original papers?²

It is unfortunate that we possess none of the replies, but it is at any rate clear that Malone set about his task in a very thorough and businesslike way. The answers returned must have been fairly satisfactory, for Malone, in the spring of 1790, printed the statement we have already quoted, declaring that both Mr. Hart, the owner of the house, and Mosely's daughter, remembered the finding of the paper. Some of this must have come from Dr. Davenport, the Vicar, who surely is above suspicion. Moreover, Malone, in his "Additions and Emendations," printed towards the close of 1790, retracted nothing, but added from Jordan's copy the text of the first part of the document. No part of the original five small leaves, "tacked together with a thread," is known to be now preserved.

¹ Halliwell, *Jordan Correspondence*, p. 8.

² *Ibid.* p. 11.

Less than six years later Malone when publishing his *Inquiry* into the Ireland forgeries (a work in which, as all the world knows, he completely and finally unmasked Ireland's frauds), modified his verdict upon John Shakespeare's Testament. The terms of this very qualified retraction are important, and at the risk of some repetition it will be well to quote the whole. Ireland had invented another Profession of Faith which he audaciously attributed to the poet himself. Of this Malone says :

The Profession of Faith before us was manifestly formed on a Confession of Faith written by one John Shakespeare which I published for the first time in the end of the year 1790. It was found about the year 1770 by one Mosely, a master bricklayer, who usually worked with his men, being employed by Mr. Thomas Hart (the fifth descendant in a direct line from our poet's sister, Joan Hart) to new-tile the old house in Stratford in which Shakespeare, on no good authority,¹ is supposed to have been born. The paper was discovered between the rafters and the tiling of the house, and the evidence respecting its authenticity transmitted to me by my friend the Rev. Dr. Davenport, Vicar of Stratford-upon-Avon, appeared to me sufficiently satisfactory to warrant its publication. But in my conjectures concerning the writer of the paper, I certainly was mistaken; for I have since obtained documents that clearly prove it could not have been the composition of any one of our poet's family, as will be fully shown in his Life.²

This promise seems never to have been redeemed.³ The documents referred to were very probably extracts from the town registers, &c., which showed (1) that John Shakespeare very commonly made his mark in signing important papers, from which it might be, and has been inferred that he could not write; and (2) that there was no trace of the existence in that family of any John Shakespeare, junior, who as Malone conjectured, might have been a brother of the poet. Let it be remarked in passing, that the deduction drawn from the fact of John Shakespeare's using a mark is now generally given up. Sir Sidney Lee does not hesitate to say of him, "When attesting documents he occasionally made his mark, but there is evidence in the Stratford archives that he could write with

¹ Sir Sidney Lee, and nearly all modern critics, incline to accept the tradition that Shakespeare must have been born there.

² Malone, *An Inquiry into the Authenticity of certain Miscellaneous Papers, &c.*, p. 198. 1796.

³ Malone left the projected *Life* incomplete.

facility, and he was credited with financial aptitude."¹ In the same work a facsimile is given of John Shakespeare's real signature.² The name is written "Jhon Shacksper," a spelling which is interesting in view of Malone's suspicion quoted above, that the testament would not be as early as the time of the poet's father because the name Shakespeare was spelt without a final *e*.³

So far, then, as concerns the external evidence, we are left with the fact that Malone, having in his hands for a considerable period the five small leaves tacked together with a thread, declared that he was satisfied that the document was written in the seventeenth century. This opinion he never retracted, though he renounced the idea that it was written by John Shakespeare *père* or *fils*. Secondly, we know that Jordan did not profess to produce the original of the first portion, but only a copy. Thirdly, Malone never in any way withdrew his statement that Mr. Hart, the owner of the house, Mosely's daughter, Mr. Payton, and others, remembered the incident of the finding of the manuscript under the tiles. Surely it is difficult in the face of these facts to suppose that the discovery was simply an invention of Jordan's.

There remains the internal evidence of the document itself, and with regard to that I confidently express the opinion that with the possible exception of the first three sections it was unquestionably written by a Catholic. Indeed, I cannot persuade myself that this profession of faith could conceivably have been a forgery made by a Protestant in the eighteenth century. To date it is of course a much more difficult matter. The spelling,⁴ as Malone points out, certainly suggests a later date than 1601, but the copy found beneath the tiles may be a copy at first or second hand of the original document. To say the truth, the sobriety and modernity of the spelling greatly augments in my judgment the improbability that the five leaves sent to Malone were a fabrication. As the Ireland forgeries abundantly show, the tendency of bogus documents is rather to exaggerate the

¹ Lee, *Life*, Illustrated edition, 1908, p. 5. Such experienced investigators as Mr. J. W. Gray, *Shakespeare's Marriage*, p. 106, and Mrs. C. C. Stopes, *Shakespeare's Family*, p. 52, incline to the same conclusion.

² *Ibid.* p. 5.

³ The same John Shakespeare's name is often spelt without a final *e* in municipal documents which could not have been written by himself.

⁴ We may assume that Malone has in general faithfully reproduced the text before him.

eccentricities of early English orthography.¹ Jordan was much too familiar with sixteenth century registers not to know that Elizabethan scribes allowed themselves an extraordinary latitude in this respect, especially in the use of *y*'s and *ie*'s (e.g. *mercy*, *mercie*, or *mercye*, *thine* or *thyne*, &c.). But it is also possible that the manuscript was a copy of a printed paper which preserved an unusually regular orthography.

On the other hand, it cannot be questioned that the use of shorter forms of a confession of faith in illness was constantly recommended by spiritual writers at this period. Many prayer-books contained something of the sort, as for example the *Manual of Prayers* of 1596, the contemporary *Enchiridium* compiled by Verepæus, the *Cæleste Palmetum* of fifty years later, the works of Blossius, &c. I content myself with quoting an example from a book printed several times in English about this period, the *Exercise of a Christian Life*, by Father Gaspar Loarte, S.J., translated by James Sancer.

A Protestation to be made in time of sicknesse.

Say first the Creed and then in manner following.

I protest here before Almighty God my maker and Redeemer, before the blessed Virgin Mary and all the whole court of heaven, namely before my Guardian Angell and all you that are here assistant about me, that by God's grace, I mind to live and dye in this faith which I have here protested, according as the Holy Catholicke and Roman Church doth understand and take it: and that I will ever more, through the grace and favour of God Almighty remaine in the unity and body of this Church, under the head our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and under his Vicar our supreme Pastour here on earth. And if heretofore any word that sounded contrary hereunto, have by dotage or lacke of judgment escaped out of my mouth; I protest here that I do not acknowledge it as mine, but will dye and live in that fayth which at this present I have protested.

One or two points may further be mentioned which seem of special weight in pronouncing against the forgery theory. In Section IV. the writer desires to receive Extreme Unction, to obtain pardon of his sins "by seeing, speaking, feeling, smelling," &c., so Malone copies it. But in another transcript of the same document made by Jordan and printed by Halli-

¹ Here is a passage from Ireland's forgery of the supposed spiritual will of William Shakespeare: "O cherishe mee like the sweete chickenne thatte under the coverte offe herre spreadynge wings receyves herre lyttle broode," &c.

well, we find "by seeing, speaking, justing, smelling." Apparently Jordan took *justing* to be a variant spelling of *jesting*. But I feel sure that both Malone and Jordan have misread the word which really stood in the Testament, and which probably enough was indistinctly written. The true word was no doubt *gusting*. To *gust* still survives in Scotland, and it was of fairly common occurrence in seventeenth century English. It means to taste or to savour, and in the form for the anointing of the lips, the priest still prays that the sick person may be forgiven all the offences he has committed by taste and speech (*quidquid per gustum et loquelam deliquisti*). Neither Malone nor Jordan could have known this, and they consequently guessed respectively that the obscure word represented *feeling* or *justing*. There was, as they could see, a tailed letter at the beginning, a tall letter in the middle, and *ing* at the end.

The length to which this article has run prevents me from noticing other points. I will only observe that for the words like "a charge in a censure," which puzzled Malone, Jordan, who probably examined the manuscript when the ink was less faded, read "like a sharp cutting razor." In any case, the idea of finding a sepulchre in Christ's Side is one thoroughly familiar to Catholic writers, while "the direfull iron of the launce," vividly recalls the *quae vulnerata lanceae mucrone diro* of the *Vexilla Regis*. The mention of "parents" in Section X may be due to the fact that the document simply follows a pre-existing form, possibly derived from the French, where *parents* need not mean more than near relations. Let me, however, add that the mention of "St. Winefrida" rather suggests to me that the writer was a woman.¹

With regard to the first three clauses of the will, the text of which only rests upon Jordan's alleged copy, I feel much less tempted to declare them authentic. Such phrases as "an unworthy member of the Holy Catholic religion," "Evangelists, Apostles, Saints, Martyrs" (instead of either "Apostles, Evangelists, Martyrs and Confessors," or at least "holy martyrs"), the words "do in the holy presence *above specified*," or again "my good and guardian angel," all arouse suspicion. Again, it is a curious thing that there is no mention of holy Viaticum or of

¹ Could it possibly have been the testament of Joan Hart the poet's sister, who may originally have written it when she was Joan Shakespeare before her marriage, and who perhaps made a second copy in her old age without changing the name? As she did not die until 1646, she lived for long years in this Henley Street house.

Mass or of loyalty to the Apostolic See, while the sentence which connects the first fragment with the second is strangely purposeless and clumsy. Still, one does not wish to accuse John Jordan of forgery without adequate reason, and this at least is certain, that the Stratford wheelwright was invited to visit Malone in London in 1799, long after the critic had stated in print that he considered the Testament not to be in the writing of any member of the poet's family. On this occasion Malone gave his humble friend a cordial welcome, which he would hardly have done to one whom he believed to be an unscrupulous forger, especially at the height of the Ireland agitation. Writing to Mr. Payton, of Stratford, Jordan says, July 1, 1799, "I breakfasted, dined, drank tea, and supped at Mr. Malone's last Thursday, and I am happy to inform you that I was treated in the most respectable and genteel manner by that truly great, good and honourable gentleman."¹

HERBERT THURSTON.

Since the above was written I have noticed that Halliwell, in his *Outlines*,² has found and printed a reply of Jordan's to Malone. Jordan's account of his recovery of the first leaf is plausible enough, but he declares that Thomas Hart did *not* know of the discovery of the Testament until he [Jordan] told him of it.

¹ *Jordan Correspondence*, p 49.

² Seventh Edition, pp. 86, 1886, vol. ii. p. 401.

Popular Retreats in the Past.

AN article in *THE MONTH* for November, 1903, entitled "A Great Social Work," first brought to the notice of English readers the wonderful development of retreats for the people,—and especially for the working people—in Belgium. In April, 1908, a second article was able to announce the establishment of a retreat house for men at Marple, near Manchester. Events since then have moved quickly. The Marple house, after a year and a half of retreats (followed by 670 men), proved too small, and Oakwood Hall, Romiley, was bought in its place—a fine country house with forty acres of ground. Oakwood Hall has been enlarged, and will shortly be enlarged still further. Some 800 men have already made retreats there with the most excellent results. Moreover, another house for men's retreats admirably adapted for the work has lately been bought near Isleworth, and will be opened next spring; while the Redemptorist Fathers are planning a similar enterprise to the north-east of the metropolis.

When we add to this the three houses of retreat for women conducted by the Religious of the Cenacle in Manchester, London, and Liverpool, we may conclude that the popular retreat is now firmly established in this country, and that its development is now only a matter of time. The Catholics of America are likewise taking up the work with enthusiasm, and societies to promote it have been formed in New York and elsewhere. Its progress in other countries during the last few years has also been remarkable.¹

But it must not be thought that these popular retreats are a new institution in the Church. Centuries ago they played an important part in the Catholic life of many lands. Indeed, it is only within the last hundred years that they became less familiar.

It may, therefore, be interesting to collect a few instances of the earlier—though not the earliest—popular retreats.

¹ A book dealing with the recent revival of retreats will, it is hoped, shortly be in the press.

The part played by St. Vincent de Paul in promoting them deserves special mention.

A *curé* of Normandy, Charles Godefroy, writes a little book entitled *Les Collèges des Saints Exercises*, and presents it in 1625 to the Bishops of France who chance to be assembled at Paris. "These Exercises," he says in effect, "have done the regular clergy a world of good. Why not institute them everywhere for the secular clergy as well?" The Bishops approve and pass a resolution. But no further steps are taken for the present.

Three years later we find the Bishop of Beauvais (who had helped to pass the resolution) lamenting to "Monsieur Vincent" that something must really be done to prepare candidates for ordination. They must make retreats.

"O Monsieur," cried the Saint, "this would be an excellent means of setting in order, by degrees, all the clergy of your diocese."

Monsieur Vincent drew up a plan of retreats and gave some of the conferences himself. The success was such that in 1631 the Archbishop of Paris established ordination retreats in his diocese. They were given six times a year, under the direction of St. Vincent. Clerics came to them from other dioceses. Finally, Saint-Lazare was acquired, and retreats were given to laity as well as to clergy. Men of all classes flocked thither,—nobles, magistrates, scholars, artisans, peasants. Vincent compared the house to Noah's ark,—partly, no doubt, on account of its miscellaneous tenants.

One day some men came to Saint-Lazare for a retreat, and found the house already full. St. Vincent would not let them be sent away. "Give them my room," he said. "Let it not be said that so great a grace was denied to anyone for want of space." That grace was given to twenty thousand men in all at Saint-Lazare, in St. Vincent's time.

The example set by their patron Saint has never been forgotten by the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul. We shall have further occasion to notice their zeal in attending and organizing retreats.

Retreats for ordination candidates soon became general. M. de Bérulle had even preceded St. Vincent de Paul in establishing them (1627), and M. Claude de la Croix and M. Olier, took them up with enthusiasm. By degrees the various synods made them a matter of rule.

One of the most striking pages in the early history of these retreats is the story of their development in Brittany. In 1663, a house of retreats for men was founded at Vannes by M. de Kerlivio, the Vicar-General, and Father Huby, S.J. A fascinating description of this house is contained in a long letter written in 1682, by Father Honoré Chaurand, a social apostle of prodigious activity, who built twenty-six hospices, and whose enthusiasm for the Exercises is another testimony to the social value of retreats.

"Two thousand men," says Father Chaurand, "come to Vannes each year. Notices of the retreats are sent to all the parishes, and posted up in the churches. The dates are also marked in the diocesan *Ordo*.¹ The clergy issue reminders from the pulpits. Those who have made retreats bring others the following year. Wives persuade their husbands to attend the Exercises, mothers their sons, and confessors their penitents."

"All classes of men come to these retreats," says Father Chaurand, "and their unanimity is gratifying and remarkable."² Particularly interesting are the accounts of the touching and simple devotions and pious practices which are introduced into these retreats: as, for instance, the processions, the distribution of crucifixes, the use made of pictures, &c. The same letter tells us how at Quimper, after the meditation on the Prodigal Son, the priest who was giving the Exercises, would take the monstrance and turn towards the men who came by turns to kneel before It in the character of the Prodigal Son. Each one received a blessing and a few touching words.

Father Chaurand also tells us of the immense scale on which the Exercises were at that time being given in Lower Brittany by Father Maunoir. This great-hearted missionary, now seventy-five years old, spent forty-five years at the work. He would give the Exercises for eight days to five hundred men at once—to fifteen hundred in the course of a month. There was no question of accommodating all these at any retreat-

¹ This practice has lasted to our own day. Retreats in Brittany have rightly been regarded not as a rare spiritual luxury, but as a normal part of parish life—an institution accessible to the people.

² "Et quoy qu'il semble qu'un Gentilhomme ou un Magistrat doive se rebuter d'être mêlé avec des Paisans, et les Abbez avec des jeunes Echoliers, neanmoins ils avoient eux-mêmes que cette multitude et la variété des personnes leur donne de la devotion. C'est ce que j'ay remarqué en la dernière bande, où je voyais en même temps fondre en larmes des Curez, des Magistrats, des Gentilshommes, des Bourgeois, des Marchands, des Artisans, des Laboureurs, des Vieillards de septante à huitante ans, et des Echoliers et d'autres jeunes garçons de boutique âgés de quinze à seize années."

house: they had to camp out or find lodgings. They brought their own food with them. Discipline was perfect, and silence absolute. Father Maunoir trained two hundred priests to aid him in the work, forty or fifty of whom would be on duty at each retreat, instructing or hearing confessions.

The example of Vannes was soon followed elsewhere. Father Houdry, writing a quarter of a century later, says that the retreats are in vogue in almost all the towns of France. A retreat-house was founded at Paris in 1682 by Father Le Valois, aided by Louis XIV. Nor was the need of retreat-houses for women overlooked. But we must return to Brittany.

Father Jean Jegou, who died in 1701 at the age of eighty-five, founded a retreat-house at Quimper. He started the work absolutely without resources; but Father Maunoir encouraged him and assured him that once a start were made the question of resources would solve itself. So it came to pass. As soon as it was known that Father Jegou was going to build a retreat-house for all classes of people, contributions poured in,—contributions in money and in kind. Some brought wood, others stones, others furniture. The women were no less generous than the men. "We are working," they said, "for the souls of our husbands and brothers and sons: and perhaps some day you will build a retreat-house for us too." Soon after the house was opened the retreat-makers numbered fifteen hundred a year. Then Father Jegou was moved to Rennes,—where he built another retreat-house.

Popular retreats in Brittany have continued till our own day under the direction of the parish clergy. In 1894 we read of a group of two hundred and fifty fishermen making a retreat of five days; in 1895 of four thousand conscripts making retreats in the various houses of Brittany. No wonder that "the faith of a Breton peasant" is praised in all the churches!

In Italy, the retreats found much favour in the eighteenth century. We hear of one hundred and fifty young men in retreat at Bologna, in 1701, during the carnival. They were followed in Lent by eighty ecclesiastics, who in turn gave place during Passion Week to seventy gentlemen and ninety ladies. At Brescia, in the following year, hundreds of people are recorded as having made retreats. Elsewhere, we again find retreats for the various classes. Even the prisoners are not forgotten.

From distant missions come letters describing the effects

of the Exercises on the non-European mind. In 1712, we hear that the neophytes in China have taken to them with enthusiasm. An interesting series of letters from Madura dating from 1719, tells of the marvellous results wrought there by the introduction of retreats. Father Bertoldi, who had already written a book on the Exercises in Tamil, gave a series of retreats to groups of neophytes with remarkable success.

Mention should be made of the importance attached to retreats by St. Alphonsus de Ligouri. Alphonsus, as a youth, had, like many a Catholic schoolboy in our times, been accustomed to make an annual retreat, a practice to which he had been introduced by his father, a bluff soldier who was in the habit of retiring into a religious house when Passiontide came round, to go through the drill of a soldier-saint. These retreats did much for the boy: but they were to do more. When Alphonsus was twenty-six he made a retreat which stirred his soul to its depths, and determined him to surrender all to God.

Small wonder that the Saint should lay particular stress upon the work of retreats when founding his Congregation, and that the Rule should especially mention the giving of retreats in Redemptorist houses. He himself directed them for clergy and laity, and in 1736 we find him borrowing a château for the purpose. More permanent provision was soon made at Ciorani. We have a picture of St. Alphonsus himself directing a retreat there, twenty years later. The place is packed, and intending retreat-makers continue to arrive. Messengers have to be sent in all directions to tell the priests and laymen who are making for the house that there is no more room. No matter; they will sleep in the porch! The Baron de Ciorani puts some of them up: others camp out in the galleries. One can dispense with comforts when St. Alphonsus is giving a retreat.

Other Redemptorist houses rivalled Ciorani in zeal. To Deliceto came Bishops with their clergy and laymen without number. The house at Deliceto will be for ever linked with the name of St. Gerard Majella, who threw himself with ardour into the work of promoting retreats there. He was indefatigable in enlisting recruits, and having secured them, he led them to God with the power and tact of a Saint.

By the middle of the eighteenth century, what may be called collegiate retreats found general favour. The Sodalities of the Blessed Virgin gave a great impetus to the movement.

At Rome the members of the *Prima Primaria* went through the Spiritual Exercises every year. So did the Sodalists of the Immaculate Conception, who were for the most part clerics. At Naples, Milan, Genoa, Turin, Parma, Bologna, Brescia, and elsewhere we find retreats established. Nor was the custom confined to Italy. It existed in the schools and colleges of France, Germany, Austria, and other lands.

The Jesuits were by no means alone in the organization of retreats. Capuchins, Lazarists, Eudists, Oratorians, and others were taking part in the work. The secular clergy were, as we have seen, busy in Brittany. In Franche-Comté the Ven. Antony Receveur instituted the *Congregation de la Retraite chrétienne* to give the Exercises to men and women. In Italy the Ven. Bruno Lanteri established a society of priests, the Oblates of the Virgin Mary, for the same purpose.

The history of popular retreats is full of romantic episodes, of enterprises which seemed quixotic until they turned out to be providential, of wild undertakings carried out, and extravagant dreams that came true. Nearly all successful retreat-houses have started with the odds against them: they have been born amidst a chorus of discouragement and christened with plentiful showers of cold water: they have been sustained in their early struggles by obstinate people with no money, but terrific confidence. One of the most picturesque instances of all this is the story of Maria Antonia de la Paz, of which the outline only can be given here.

This astonishing woman was born in 1730, at Santiago del Estero, in the Argentine Republic. At the age of fifteen she renounced the world, and lived a life of extreme solitude and penance for twenty years. Then came the conviction that to establish popular retreats would be the best way of restoring religion in the country; so Maria Antonia sallied forth from her solitude, dressed in a strange costume and bearing a kind of pastoral staff, to tramp over half a continent, and preach a crusade in favour of popular retreats. The task seemed sufficiently hopeless; there were no houses for the purpose, and no means of providing them. People were apathetic and even hostile. Yet this valiant lady kept up her crusade for a quarter of a century.

Could anything come of such a wild notion? Well, Maria Antonia herself provided retreats for one hundred thousand people: and after her death the work was carried on by a

number of her disciples, who were later on formed into a religious community. In 1899, the centenary of her death, a great retreat-house was built on the site of her first foundation. So her work is still flourishing, and it may be of interest to recall a few details about its beginnings.

Are we to picture Maria Antonia as a terribly domineering person who bullied the rich into giving her money, and worried the Bishops into giving her authorization, and interfered with the priests who gave the retreats? By no means. She never worried herself or other people about money: it came in abundance whenever it was wanted. As for the Bishops, they soon discovered her worth and contended with each other for her presence in their respective dioceses. Nor did she interfere in the working of the retreats. She provided the resources, acted as housekeeper and cook, and supported the work by her incessant prayers and astounding mortifications.

After establishing a house at Santiago del Estero, she resumed her staff and set off, bare-footed, and accompanied by one or two Indian women, to found more retreat-houses. The little band was regarded with astonishment and even dismay. But the courage of Antonia was never damped. Everywhere she interviewed the ecclesiastical authorities, founded a house, procured funds, and set the retreats going. Her journeys, without provisions and in the teeth of dangers, read like a romance.

We possess several charming letters of Maria Antonia written to the Jesuits who had been exiled from Argentina.

At Cordoba [she writes] in the house that used to be yours we have had fourteen retreats, each attended by from two hundred to three hundred people: and all this, by the singular mercy of God, without the least difficulty as regards accommodation, food, or anything else! It has all been done with the alms which have been spontaneously offered to me.

She declares that she has never taken a step without first ascertaining that it was God's will: "But He seems to lead me by the hand, without my being able to understand or explain how it happens." She describes how she has been miraculously cured on several occasions. To her former confessor she sends a message which is touching in its humility.

Tell him that I am now only a poor old woman, good for nothing, and more wicked than ever.

In 1779, this indomitable "old woman" decided to go to Buenos Ayres. Here she found formidable obstacles. The Bishop was unfavourable and the people apathetic. But the personality of the woman broke down all hesitation or opposition. In the end the Bishop became enthusiastic and the people took fire. A retreat-house was fitted up for a hundred people. At the third retreat it was inconveniently crowded. The Exercises were given to groups of women as well as to men, and the great ladies of the town came to make retreats with their poorer sisters, to their own great profit and pleasure.

Three years later, a great proportion of the inhabitants of Buenos Ayres had made retreats. By this time the Bishop's enthusiasm knew no bounds. He frequently visited the house and (the detail is supplied by Maria Antonia herself, who, we must remember, helped in the kitchen) sampled the food, which he pronounced to be excellent. Thirty-four retreats had been given in fifteen months, each attended by over two hundred people and lasting for ten days. The Viceroy of Peru and nearly all the clergy were among the retreat-makers. By 1784, thirty thousand people had made retreats in Buenos Ayres alone. But figures mean little: the important thing to notice is that the whole character of the people had changed. Maria Antonia next visited Montevideo, where she organized retreats for five hundred people at a time. In 1799, she ended her long work, now in truth "an old woman." Her path through life had been marked by unflagging zeal and a strong common-sense: it was also, we are told, brightened by miracles.

Passing on to the early nineteenth century we find, besides the now well-established clergy retreats, a certain number of houses for the laity. Mention must be made of the house of Ponterotto in Rome, associated as it is with so many great names.

This house was founded by a priest named Joachim Michelini, a man of extraordinary zeal, who about the year 1805 set himself to prepare the young people of Rome for their First Communion. The times were bad: the Napoleonic invasion had thrown all into confusion, and religious instruction was at a low ebb. The only remedy seemed to be the establishment of a regular house of retreats for those who were preparing to make their First Communion.

Father Michelini secured a tumble-down palace which was being used as a granary, and set to work to beg unblushingly.

Humiliations came thick and fast,—and finally approbation and support. The founder did not live to see the development of his work: but the special providence which seems given to retreat-houses did not fail. The house found directors and friends among the saintliest men of that day. Cardinal Odescalchi, the Ven. Vincent Pallotti, the Ven. Gaspar del Bufalo took charge of it in turn. Cardinal Mezzofanti and several of his colleagues would help to serve at table. In the register of the retreats, about 1826, we often read that the Exercises were given by Canon Giovanni Maria Mastai, who later on, as Pope Pius IX., was often to visit the house and give Communion.

In Rome, too, retreats for Pontifical soldiers were started by Mgr. Piatti in 1819. Elsewhere Congregations were founded to promote retreats for the laity,—the Congregation of Marie Reparatrice, and, in 1832, the Congregation of La Louvesc.

These examples are perhaps enough to show that the work of retreats for the laity was never wholly discontinued, though it cannot be said to have flourished during the first half of the nineteenth century. The suppression of the Society of Jesus had dealt a heavy blow at the popular giving of the Exercises. In 1834 Father Roothaan, the General of the Society, urged the restored Order to take up with the old enthusiasm the instrument which had proved so effective in the past: but it was some time before this could be done on any large scale. The second spring of the retreat movement was not to appear for another forty years or so.

Yet there were indications of what was to come; and with one of these we may close our fragmentary record of the earlier movement.

About the year 1859, retreats for laymen were established during the vacations at the ecclesiastical seminary of Viviers. Twenty years later we find 250 men making retreats there in the course of one season,—a number which was not unsatisfactory for those days. They were largely recruited from among the members of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, to whom circulars had been sent out by a committee of laymen under the direction of the Bishop. It was not the first time that this great Society had co-operated in the work: nor was it to be the last. But we are here in sight of the modern revival of popular retreats of which something has already been said in previous articles.

CHARLES PLATER.

Gracechurch Papers.

III. MISS SMOLLETT'S RING.

ONE peculiar feature of the country round Gracechurch was that you could hardly take an hour's drive in the neighbourhood without falling in with a bit of Flintshire wandering about of its own accord without the slightest reference to the main bulk of that county. But if you really wanted to go into Wales you had to leave the town by Scotland Street, Grange Road, or Trimpley.

Why Scotland Street should have been the beginning of a high road into the Welsh Principality no one ever inquired or explained. On entering Gracechurch that way the first house on one's left was attached to a brewery, of which we had a good many, as was natural, seeing that the tradesmen and farmers were much disposed to retire at about sixty years of age and devote the rest of their time to drinking themselves to death in an unconvivial decorous fashion.

The brewery-house at the entrance of Scotland Street was an uncharacteristic newish building, of white-house brick, with red brick round the window and door frames, which gave it a look of having sore eyes.

A hundred yards beyond it you came to two genteel residences, one of which was of a good size ; the other, stuck to it like a limpet, was quite small, and turned aside at an angle as if slightly shocked by its neighbour and anxious to forget its existence.

In this smaller house, which was as spruce and white as a tiny yacht, lived the two Miss Drays. Of course there had been four once, but two had married. The youngest but one of the four was Mrs. Wakefield, a widow with a quiet son who was in process of becoming a clergyman, and apt to come and spend Christmas with his aunts, on which occasions he would read the lessons at church, in a profuse perspiration and a glittering pair

of spectacles that reflected all the Apostles in the east window. He was a blameless youth, but not entirely approved by Miss Harriet Dray, who suspected him of Puseyite leanings, owing to her having detected him in the act of absent-mindedly turning towards the altar at the "Glory be to the Father" at the end of one of the Psalms. The late Rector, Mr. Knight, had also been, if not exactly "high," of an upward tendency, and all the choir and free seats faced eastward during the Creed; but to turn in the same direction at the *Gloria Patri* was what Miss Harriet could not away with. She was, as she informed her contemporaries with a snort like that of a whale, Protestant to the backbone. If she had said all down her backbone a more extensive idea would have been conveyed, for there was at least a yard of it. Miss Harriet had a large face, large teeth, and black hair and eyes and eyebrows, and a manner that was composed of crinoline and jet bugles. The other married sister, Mrs. Bumpus, resembled her, but with ameliorations. The arch of her eyebrows was less aggressive, and her lips were thinner and not so frequently employed in loud criticism. Mrs. Bumpus had married well, and there was infinite complacency in the ample folds of her velvet gown. Miss Harriet wore velveteen—with the air of preferring it.

Miss Dray was much the nicest of the four sisters, and not in the least like them, though the other three grew less and less like her till the difference culminated in Miss Harriet, who was the youngest. Miss Dray was plain, but her face was pleasant, and she was clever and well-educated. Her manner was literary, and rather gentlemanly, and her humour had a slightly Rabelaisian flavour. It was supposed that, though she actually spoke English, she might have ordered dinner in Greek or Hebrew had she been so disposed. When these ladies came to call, Miss Harriet's crinoline filled our little parlour, and her voice filled the house, for, though she refused to touch my mother's speaking-trumpet, she bellowed at her across the room, and seemed rather irate at receiving only conjectural smiles in reply. At last she bent the weight of her conversation on me.

"Are you deaf, too, little boy?"

"No. Only mamma," I replied meekly, as one disclaiming distinctions confined to his betters.

"H'm. How old are you?"

"Six."

"Not a bad age of its kind," she admitted with grim

concession. "What's your name?"

"John Francis Edward Plantagenet Ayscough."

"Good lord! Who on earth gave you those names?"

"Do you mean," I inquired doubtfully, "'my godfathers and godmothers in my baptism?'" She did not seem to do her part quite right. "I haven't any. I was going to die, and my father baptized me in the India china pot-pourri bowl."

"Was your father a clergyman?"

"Yes."

"I wonder you didn't die while he was spoutin' out all those names. Can you read?"

"Not well. I'm delicate——"

"You should do everything well you do at all. There's nothing indelicate in reading."

"Depends on the book, Harry," Miss Dray interjected from the top of the trumpet.

I liked Miss Dray best, because she did not ask questions and had not disapproving eyebrows. She did not wear a crinoline, and never had done so, which was supposed to be connected somehow with her ability to converse in dead languages. She wore, however, a good many teeth which she could rattle in her mouth when scoring a conversational point or achieving the climax of an anecdote.

When the ladies were gone, Mrs. Hornskull appeared with the tea-tray, anxious to attach her imprimatur to our visitors.

"Independent ladies, ma'am," she declared, "and deeply respected. Miss Dray taught Sunday school a many years and never let none of the gals come in crinolines. If they dared to, she just sent 'em out into the churchyard to take 'em off, behindst a tombstone. Miss Dray's cousin is a magistrate and it's unknown what she gives in charity. I've one of her petticoats on now, and beautiful long flannen. Miss Harriet's the youngest and Madam Dray made up her mind it was to be a boy—having three girls already: she settled it all, how he was to be a colonel of dragoons like her own father."

I could not help thinking Miss Harriet would have done well had she fallen in with these arrangements; and immediately pictured her as a dragoon officer, mounted on a big horse, eyebrows, crinoline and all. As time went on, my mother and Miss Dray became great friends: I used to sit in her bow-window and look out, while they talked. The old lady was full

of anecdote, some of her stories, as I have hinted, having a fruity, after-dinner twang about them. I fancy their big relations also liked her better than Miss Harriet, for she was much oftener invited to Drayton Hall, and had met there all sorts of fine folk, of whom she had many interesting and odd things to tell. She called lords by their names, as the Almighty does the stars, and could speak of a duke with no more awe than if he had been a Rural Dean.

"Oh, yes," people would say at Gracechurch. "Miss Dray is *very* well-connected"—but no one ever made the same remark in reference to Miss Harriet. Miss Harriet was seldom in when we called, being much addicted to stalking about with a boon companion, of a masculine type like her own, called Miss Toms of the Square, to distinguish her from another Miss Toms of whom more anon.

And now for the larger house to which that of the Miss Drays looked like an appendage or supplement. It was very spick and span, and as white as the deck of a man-of-war: it had a large olive-green front door under a portico, with four Corinthian columns; those pillars, and a full-sized footman who was very commonly to be seen standing between them, surveying the street with a languid air of awaiting titled visitors, made Magnolia House seem bigger than it really was.

In Magnolia House lived the Reverend Angus Smollett and his sister, who was unmarried like himself, and had mellowed in the suns of some five-and-forty autumns. Except in her handsome carriage, drawn by a pair of prosperous, shining bay horses, Miss Smollett was not much seen in Gracechurch: for she was an invalid, and had something the matter with her back which made it difficult for her to get in and out of the landau. Nor were the Gracechurch folk very familiar with the inside of Magnolia House. Miss Smollett gave no tea-parties, and accepted invitations to none, which Gracechurch said was due to her back, but resented all the same. Once or so in the winter Mr. Smollett gave a dinner-party, but only gentlemen were bidden, and his sister did not appear. He was never regarded as a Gracechurchman: partly because he showed no desire to be so considered, and partly because he had quarrelled with the Rector. He was incumbent of a scattered, out-lying village called Pentichiland, close to the Welsh border, but originally forming part of one huge parish. The Rector had been chiefly instrumental in getting the church built and also

in having the Scottish clergyman appointed to the new cure. But the moment he appeared on the scene Mr. Smollett began to fight, and to use acidulous gifts of tongue and pen in a manner that set all Gracechurch up in arms. He was flatly Ritualist, and that circumstance did not win any one to his side.

To Miss Harriet Dray it was a grievance that she could never go in and out of her own door without passing his: behind those white walls he might be crossing himself at any moment: he did it in his own church "as bold as a lion," and in ours too, when he came there of a Sunday evening (he had a curate out at Pentichiland and left the evening service to him) to sit in the pew belonging to Magnolia House.

"Why don't he sit in the stalls *like* a clergyman," Miss Harriet loudly complained, "and read one of the lessons as our nephew Wakefield does? I hate to see him there in the pew in coat and trousers."

"He couldn't well sit there without 'em, Harry," Miss Dray reminded her.

Miss Harry shook herself.

"I've no patience," she snapped. "To see him cross himself at the end of the Belief—and all the free seats nudging to look at him."

"I believe you go for nothing else yourself," her sister declared, with cheerful but provoking conviction. "You never did go to evening church till you heard of him and his crossings. And you came home as cross as two sticks one night when he wasn't there."

"He's a Jesuit in disguise," Miss Harry opined savagely.

"If he's a Jesuit he'd disguise himself better by giving over crossing himself," observed Miss Dray.

"He's too vain to restrain himself: the man's as silly and weak as an autumn gosling."

"Depend upon it," said Miss Dray, "he's no Jesuit."

Mr. Smollett really seemed to exercise a fell fascination over Miss Harriet. She could not keep out of his way, and they were always running up against one another. If he came in from a ride she was sure to be starting for a walk: if he went out for a walk she would be just returning from one: and their hall-doors were not a dozen paces apart; for, as we have hinted, the front entrance of Miss Dray's house looked like a side entrance of Mr. Smollett's. On these occasions the lady

would bristle up and sweep by with a bow that was a whole Confession of Augsburg in itself; and the gentleman would raise his hat with a mild air of protest at having to do it again so soon. Of course these *rencontres* did not always pass unobserved; in fact, Mrs. Moorcock noted most of them. Her house was a good hundred yards further down the street on the opposite side, but her bow-window raked it as far as the turning either way. She had no children to occupy her, and her servants gave her no trouble. Dr. Moorcock was generally out on his rounds, and Mrs. Moorcock spent most of the last thirty years of her life knitting quilts in her bow-window, an occupation that left her perfectly free to observe anything of interest outside. True, she was not near enough to note the expression of Mr. Smollett's face as he lifted his hat, or to grasp the Protestant significance of Miss Harriet's bow: but she saw the meetings and did not attribute them to accident on both sides at all events.

"Old Harry Dray's setting her cap at Mr. Smollett," Mrs. Moorcock informed her husband.

"You shouldn't call her old Harry: it sounds like someone else. She'll need to be as clever as her namesake if she wants to catch *that* bird."

"Well, she runs after him enough with the salt, anyway," retorted Mrs. Moorcock, giving a kind of probe into her chignon with the knitting-needle she had just knitted off; when, many a long year after I had left Gracechurch for ever, I used to see officers of the *dogana* thrusting long iron rods into the haycarts that entered Rome from the Campagna by the Porta San Sebastiano, it never failed to remind me of Mrs. Moorcock.

Whether Miss Smollett was a Jesuit in disguise too, Gracechurch was unable to decide. She never came to church, and Miss Harry asserted her conviction that the woman was a flat Catholic, and no bones about it, a theological position as offensive evidently as that of a disguised Jesuit. Others, however, said Miss Smollett merely stayed away from church on account of her back, while some flew as far from Miss Harry's opinion as possible by declaring their belief that the invalid lady was a Presbyterian, that she detested her brother's Popish tricks, and could not bring herself to sit in the same pew with a man who crossed himself and burrowed his head down under the bookrail during the Absolution.

"What with her back and her brother the poor thing's to be

pitied *in spite of her money-bags*," said Miss Clupp, with quite angry compassion.

Miss Clupp was a superannuated nursery-governess residing in apartments, *i.e.*, one blear-eyed room over Thomson's, the bookseller's, a room that always smelt of cats and printer's ink.

As to Miss Smollett's money-bags, anyone was at liberty to commiserate their owner, but no one could doubt their existence. Her horses were better than Sir James Billington's, her carriage much newer and better-built than Mrs. Wymening's of Wheatley Park; she wore expensive clothes as though she had never put on anything cheaper in her life; her coachman and footman were well-trained London servants, tall, smart, and in first-rate liveries; and her household was if anything too large for her house. It was notorious in Gracechurch that she and her brother had soup and fish every day, and those who had seen her indoors declared that Miss Smollett's jewelry was good enough for a Lady Gracechurch herself.

Miss Clupp, who really had nothing to give herself, was an indefatigable collector when any subscription was afoot, and on an errand of this sort she once made her way into the drawing-room of Magnolia House. The footman had only committed himself so far as to say that he believed Miss Smollett was not at home, but would go and see, if Miss Clupp would walk in. She walked in, and noted sharply that the hall had a Turkey carpet "good enough for any nobleman's house": and, as there was no one in the drawing-room, she had leisure to take in its air of tasteful luxury, which she did with a sniff which would really have served her turn if Miss Smollett's money-bags had been sacks of guano.

Presently a very well-bred, well-dressed elderly lady came in and said simply that she was Miss Smollett's "companion"; that Miss Smollett was in, but too unwell to receive visitors to-day. Could she take any message?

Miss Clupp was not best pleased at having to declare her errand through a third party, but did so, and the lady-companion left the room, returning in less than five minutes with a ten-pound note. During her absence Miss Clupp had made up her mind that Miss Smollett's being unwell was all moonshine, and that the canny Scots lady had scented the sort of object her visitor had in view. "Trust a Scotchwoman for knowing how to defend her purse," said Miss Clupp to herself, eyeing, with another sniff, a Dresden china group that must, she often afterwards

declared, have been worth a king's ransom.

"Miss Smollett is so sorry," said her *dame de compagnie*, "that she is really not fit to come down. The subscription seems to be for a most worthy object and she sends this."

When the footman showed Miss Clupp out she was too much overcome to go far, and dropped in next door to recover herself.

No one ever saw Miss Smollett indoors so often as the writer of these papers, who had already lived four or five years in Gracechurch before his acquaintance with the high-church clergyman and his sister began.

One Sunday afternoon in spring the little boy had walked out as far as Pentichiland to church, and on his way home, Mr. Smollett, driving himself in a smart dog-cart, with a smart groom on the back seat, overtook him.

"Shall I give you a lift?" said the gentleman, pulling up. "Come, skip up."

The small pedestrian had hesitated: partly out of shyness, partly because it seemed a strong measure, perhaps even slightly traitorous, to accept of "lifts" from the Rector's acrimonious antagonist.

"Come, you look tired, up you get," insisted the young man—he was fifteen years his sister's junior. And the little boy obeyed, not without misgiving.

It was very pleasant being driven quickly along instead of trudging through the March dust, and Mr. Smollett was pleasant too. When we got to Magnolia House he said it was tea-time, and clearly took it for granted I was to come in and have tea with him. He gave the reins to the groom and almost pushed me in. In the drawing-room his sister lay on a sofa with Miss Fergusson reading aloud to her.

"Maysie, I've brought a visitor," said Mr. Smollett. "I needn't tell you his name."

"No, my dear," the lady answered, but speaking to me, with a kind, delightful smile. "My brother has often told me about your mother and you: he says he wonders how, being deaf, she can have patience to sit through the long service in church and hear nothing. But I think from what he tells me she hears the angels singing."

She held out a very soft white hand, with splendid rings terribly loose upon it. And her brother bent over her and asked her in a low voice if she had had much pain.

"Scarcely any, Angus. . . . Tea's ready, we were only waiting for you."

The footman came in with another cup for me, and soon Miss Smollett and Miss Fergusson were busy seeing that I had cake and fruit.

When I thought it was time to go Miss Smollett said No, I must look at all her pretty things, and she sent me about the room to examine each of them while she told me all about it. Everything seemed to have some sort of history. One little silver cup had belonged to Prince Charlie, whom she called King Charles III., and she mentioned his name with a kind of sorrowful reverence.

"Do you think," she asked, "your mother would come and see me? I cannot make visits, but if she would come I should like it so much, and should be so grateful. Now, you two, run off somewhere. I want to talk secrets."

The other lady and Mr. Smollett did what they were told, and when we were alone Miss Smollett said:

"Come here; close to me, or I can't talk secrets. You've got a new suit of clothes on; has it pockets?"

"It's not a new suit," I answered, for new clothes very seldom came my way.

"Well, it looks new. When Angus was a little boy (I was grown up, you know), he always expected me to put something in the pockets if he had a new suit. May I do it now—in yours?"

She popped two fingers in one of my waistcoat pockets, and left two sovereigns there; but I plucked them out again, blushing very red.

"I do not think mama would like it," I said, holding them out to her.

"Yes, she would, if she knew how few pleasures a poor sick woman like me can have. And listen, Johnnie. To-day I have had a legacy—I mean the news came by post this morning. An old friend of ours has died, and to show he remembered me he left me five hundred pounds in his will to buy a ring with. I don't want any more rings, but I suppose I must buy one. Anyway, I made up my mind to give someone a little present to-day, and you're the only person I have seen to give it to. Tell your mother, and you'll see she won't grudge me my little pleasure."

Both my mother and I often saw Miss Smollett after that,

but I was constantly being sent for to sit and talk to her while Miss Fergusson went for a drive or a walk. Sometimes she would say, "I've never bought that ring; I must see about it. Meanwhile the money is invested in the Caledonian Bank, and it's not worth while selling it out till I've made up my mind what ring to buy with it."

How many happy, very quiet hours have I spent in dear Miss Smollett's pretty drawing-room. Often reading aloud to her, at other times listening to her Scottish folk-tales and legends, of which she had a store inexhaustible! Everything in her well-appointed house seemed to go smoothly. It was always quiet, prosperous, luxurious, without the least ostentation or extravagance. Hundreds of times I have congratulated myself on her being so well off, quite as if it were a matter of good luck personal to myself, for her wealth eased the burden of life-long ill-health and suffering. Almost all of her five and forty years had been spent in pain. But she was never peevish, nor had her face the sour pinched expression so commonly seen on that of a cripple.

Only once did she ever allude to her ample means, and it was in reference to her legacy, which she always seemed to regard as a sort of joke.

"I'm sure it was uncommon nice of Sir Sholto to remember me," she said, half laughing, "but I wish he had not put it on my conscience to buy another ring. He might have left me a book, or a snuff-box, or one of his top-hats—nothing could have reminded me of him like one of his hats, for no one else was ever seen in anything like them. If I had happened to be as poor as a rat I daresay he *would* have left me one of them. My Aunt Pringle, that never had sixpence, used to tell how her godmother, Lady Moneyppenny, who was as rich as Dives, gave her a present, the last time she went to see her, of all the used night-light cases she had burned for thirty years."

"'They're surprisin' for making a fire burn up, my dear,'" she assured Aunt Jean, "'and I've saved 'em all for you that can't afford to waste anything.' But people don't dare to leave or give rubbish to legatees as well off as themselves. Sir Sholto could not see his way to less than five hundred in my case, knowing that I didn't need anything at all. Why didn't he leave it to Angus? Angus has not five hundred a year in the world. Our father was all for spending, with nothing to spend. So was his mother. *My* mother had no idea of spending when she

could possibly do anything else—and she had heaps of money. When Angus and I were left alone in the world, of course I wanted to share and share alike, but he wouldn't hear of it. He'll have it all when I'm dead, and he'll be a young fellow still, with time enough to marry, if he wants to. All the same, I wish he would have taken half at once—though it's all *my* mother's money, I'm sure *his* mother was as kind to me as if I'd been her child; and he and I have never been step-brother and sister."

As a matter of fact they lived as though they *had* shared everything. Mr. Smollett lived like a wealthy man, and it was actually he who paid all the bills, though his sister found the money.

One January evening, a fortnight or so after Christmas, I was sitting with Miss Smollett, and she had been reading me little bits out of her letters—the second post was a new thing lately introduced at Gracechurch, and not approved by everybody.

"I must say I am glad of it," she was saying. "I get my letters from Scotland the day after they're written now." Then she told me some quaint or interesting thing about her correspondents, about their homes or their family traditions. She and her brother had a way of talking to me as if I were quite grown up, and of course I liked it.

"Now there's nothing left but the paper," she said at last, and opened the *Scotsman* with quite an air of affection. "Dear me! This concerns me!" she cried, in a voice of mock-tragedy. "The Caledonian Bank has stopped payment! I shall not have to buy Sir Sholto's ring after all—and I'd just decided it should be sapphires—I've got a half hoop of diamonds, and one of emeralds and one of rubies, you see. But, Johnnie dear! we mustn't laugh: it's a bad business, no doubt, for some folks . . ." and her kind voice grew grave and tender at once.

Presently Miss Fergusson came in, and her friend told her about the failure of the great bank.

"*You've* no shares in it, have you, Margot? No, of course. To tell the truth I half thought of giving you Sir Sholto's five hundred pounds—only you'll never take anything. But I daresay we shall have to hear of losses among our friends. What does unlimited liability mean?" Miss Fergusson did not quite know, but I thought an anxious look came over her face, and wondered if someone dear to her had money in this bank.

Mr. Smollett did not come in till after I had gone home:

he knew unlimited liability meant just this, that his sister had lost every penny she possessed : not only the five hundred pounds her friend had left her to buy a ring with, but all she had : her large income, her carriages, everything that had made soft the asperities of her life of pain and suffering. When she understood what had happened all her grief was for her brother and her friend. "Oh, Angus. If only you had taken your half at once !" she cried, "you know I wanted to share and share alike. And poor Margot ! There was five thousand pounds for you in my will : and now I've nothing to leave either of you. I thought it would be so soon that I needn't insist on having my own way at once—and people are so queer, they don't like being *given* what is going to be theirs, till one is dead." She had not a thought to give to her own great loss.

"Well, well," she said in her quaint half-joky way, "I've often worried about the eye of a needle, I was such a camel ! *That* needn't puzzle me any more."

JOHN AYSCOUGH.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

The Unconsecrated Chalice.¹

IT appears worth while to put on record some brief notes regarding a late survival of the purification after Communion spoken of in our last issue, a survival which presumably is of English origin. Thanks to the kindness of Mgr. Grosch and Mr. Egerton Beck, the writer has learnt that, down to a very few years since, the purification was regularly administered on Communion days to the students of the English College at Lisbon. As the former, an old Lisbon student, explains in detail, on ordinary occasions a large silver goblet containing water was handed round from one communicant to the other and was wiped by the communion-cloth, which was held by all kneeling in the semicircle. On more solemn feasts, the students came up in fours to the foot of the altar and after receiving went, if they were in Holy Orders, to the right to drink wine from a chalice which was held by a master of ceremonies. If they were not yet in Holy Orders, they passed to the left and drank, if they pleased, from the silver goblet containing water. The practice seems to have been discontinued some twenty-five years ago by order of the late President, Mgr. Hilton. Mgr. Grosch suggests that the custom had been introduced by the original founders of the College who came from Douay about 1630, at a period when there is no doubt that such a purification was usual both at Douay itself and among the persecuted Catholics on English soil.

It may be further noticed that St. Charles Borromeo in his Instructions for Parish Priests (*Instructiones Pastorum*) is very minute in his regulations concerning the purification after Communion. On great occasions, *e.g.*, at the general Communion at Eastertide, he directs that two special assistants are to stand on either side of the sanctuary. They are to hold in the right hand the vessel (*vasculum*) from which the purification

¹ See THE MONTH, October, pp. 449, seq.

is to be drunk, and in the left hand a cloth with which each communicant is afterwards to wipe his mouth. But St. Charles further makes provision that a supply of wine and of water is to be ready at hand, as well as a smaller vessel containing water alone for those who do not drink wine (*ut aqua ministretur iis qui vinum non bibunt*). A somewhat different arrangement, by which each communicant passes the vessel and the towel to her next neighbour, is recommended when women are communicating. Further, even on ordinary days in a small church, when only a handful of people wish to receive the Holy Eucharist, there is to be some place near the altar where the purification is prepared and the communicant is instructed that after receiving the Host and waiting the interval of a *Pater* and *Ave*, he is to rise from his knees and *by all means* go to take the purification (*deinde consurgens omnino se purificatum vadat*) in the place appointed for that purpose. Further, each communicant is to refrain from spitting for half an hour, even after having received the purification, neither is he to allow a less interval to pass before he takes food of any sort.¹

H. T.

Capital Punishment.

Early last month the London Catholic clergy—and we presume those of other denominations also—received a circular letter on behalf of the “Romilly Society,” inviting them to a Conference “to consider what is the best method of dealing with criminals convicted of murder,” and they were urged to attend “in view of the declaration of His Holiness the Pope of Rome, that he intends asking all the kings, emperors, legislators, and chief statesmen of Christian countries to abolish CAPITAL PUNISHMENT throughout Christendom.” We venture to think that if any of the clergy have responded to that invitation they will not have done so on the strength of the alleged intention of His Holiness, which, in fact, turns out to have no better support than a statement in the *Sunday Times*, copied from the *Paris Figaro*! It is, of course, not impossible for the Pope to hold, as many people do hold, that the ends secured by capital punishment could be better secured by some other means, but it is, we venture to say, in the highest degree unlikely that His Holiness

¹ St. Charles Borromeo, *Instructiones Pastorum*, Augsburg, 1758, pp. 172 and 192.

would take public action in the matter to the extent of memorializing the Governments of Christendom. The Papal action is generally confined, as Pope Pius and his predecessors have abundantly shown, to setting forth the implications of God's law or protesting against manifest violations of it. We should as soon expect a Papal pronouncement against Free Trade as against Capital Punishment, and the reason is clear. Both belong to that sphere which is exclusively civil and with which the Church has no commission to interfere. In other words, Capital Punishment is not against justice. Its abolition may be advocated on grounds of policy but not on those of Christian principle. The power which the civil State has received from God for its own well-being includes the right of cutting off unworthy members by death. God Himself in the primitive revelation—"Whoso sheddeth man's blood, his blood shall be shed" (Gen. ix. 6)—and in the positive law He enacted—for the Jews enjoined the penalty of death for many offences, and there is no sign that this, like divorce, was a mere permission granted on account of the hardness of men's hearts. Those who blindly take Evolution as their guide will argue that, just as slavery, mutilation, and the use of torture in judicial processes were formerly thought lawful, but are now considered alien to the Christian spirit, so the fuller understanding of that spirit should prompt us to regard Capital Punishment as a relic of barbarism. But this is assuming that all advance is in the right direction and that there is no such thing in the world at large as a weakening of the sense of right and wrong. As a matter of fact, Capital Punishment is largely opposed through a false notion of what punishment is, and this because of a want of appreciation of the real nature of sin. It is opposed on principles which would tend to prove God Himself unjust in ordaining eternal punishment for the reprobate. Yet, except in the one case where the merits of Christ are consciously made his own by the repentant sinner, there is no escaping the law that "as a man soweth, so shall he reap." Our innate sense of justice, which is a reflection of the Divine rectitude, is outraged by the idea of unpunished sin. Consequently the *retributive* element is essential to the true notion of punishment: something equivalent to the wrong done must be paid back by the wrong-doer: no one can be allowed to do evil and not be in some way the loser by it. What would be un-Christian in the individual, *sc.*, the exaction of retribution on personal grounds

alone, is justified in the State as representing the divine authority. For this reason if ever the State finds that the death-penalty adequately represents the specific crime committed, it may use the power delegated to it by God to enforce that penalty. The other aspects of punishment, its *medicinal* aspect and its *deterrent*, are equally present in this particular form. In the case of the criminal, it effectually prevents any repetition of his offence whilst leaving him scope for repentance, and as regards others, it is clear that the example of the extremest penalty must also be the most effective check. The State therefore cannot divest itself of the right of Capital Punishment. It may confine it to the very grossest and most deliberate crimes:¹ it may lay it aside for the time, as some Governments have done. But it may always reassume it. The French Government, terrified by its *Apaches*, has in fact put it again in force, and latterly a Congress of German jurists has even considered the propriety of extending its scope.

So that, assuming His Holiness to have uttered words which may be taken to indicate his disapproval of Capital Punishment, we may be sure that it was not as supreme interpreter of faith and morals that he has so spoken.

J. K.

Anglican Apologetics.

The Resurrection of our Lord from the dead was made by Himself and His Apostles the supreme test of the truth of His mission, and the reality of His claims. Accordingly, it has always had to bear the brunt of infidel attacks: it once overthrown, the Christian position would be practically lost. And equally naturally, it is strenuously defended by all Christians, but unfortunately not equally well. There are wrong as well as right ways of defence, and a recent Anglican apology,² although inspired by the best intentions, illustrates, we regret to say, one of the wrong. The author is dominated by a nervous dread of "modern thought" and "scientific research," as if everything "modern" were necessarily true and all scientific pretensions were justified. He labours, moreover, under the common disability that handicaps all non-

¹ Its scope, as we know, was once scandalously wide in England as elsewhere.

² *Studies in the Resurrection of Christ: An Argument.* By Charles H. Robinson, D.D. Longmans & Co. Price, 6d. net. 1911.

Catholic apologists in that his ultimate appeal is to subjective reason and personal experience, nay, even to instinct—"our instinct," he tells us (p. 49), "refuses to admit that the greatest blessings which have come to mankind have been the result of a mistake." To attempt to expound the Christian faith without reference to the final authority of the Christian Church, to interpret the Scriptures without taking account of the age-long Christian tradition, is a hopeless task. What avails it to quote Westcott and Gore, Milligan, Latham and Lodge? Their views of the Gospel incidents cannot carry conviction one way or the other; other men use their mental faculties on the same material with different results. Who is to decide, in default of a teacher equipped with the power and commissioned with the task of decision?

Canon Robinson's little book, therefore, tells us what Canon Robinson—a man devoid of all guidance save that of his natural faculties and such other merely human authorities as he chooses to call in corroboration of his views—thinks about the Resurrection and the evidence that supports it. Since he can imagine no use in the Risen Life for the organs and members which our Lord possessed before His death, he declares that the Resurrection-Body was *not* that which was crucified and laid in the tomb, but one fashioned for the immediate purpose, and temporarily endowed with attributes such as extension and palpability which that purpose necessitated. The mortal Body, he suggests (p. 20), "was caused to disappear" by miraculous agency, in order to provide the striking evidence of the empty tomb. Hence, though he does not seem to realize it, the author actually accuses the risen Lord of a series of detailed and deliberate deceptions practised on His followers, for no one can deny that the Gospel records point to the fixed belief of those followers in the fact of a material resuscitation of the dead Body of Christ. Surely an admission of that sort is a veritable betrayal of the citadel—rank Docetism! Our Lord becomes merely a bodiless Spirit, who borrows some sort of visible substance in order to convince His followers of His continued existence after death! And instead of conquering death, He is vanquished by it just as every merely human being is. To such lengths does undue deference to the dicta of "science" lead the unwary apologist. Canon Robinson is plainly misled by the assumption that the properties of matter as we know them here—extension, weight, resistance, &c.—are so essential

to it that they cannot be wholly or in part removed without destroying the material substance itself, which shows that he has little conception of the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, or little understanding of the teaching of St. Paul. He is misled, moreover, by the notion that our Lord's Resurrection is the model *in every respect* of our own, and that, because we cannot in the nature of things expect to reassume every particle of the material bodies we laid down at death, therefore there was no material identity between the post-Resurrection Body of Christ and that which was hung upon the Cross. These are exceedingly slight and uncertain grounds on which to dismiss the emphatic Gospel witness to the revivification of that same Divine Body which was the instrument of our Redemption. The same tendency to yield to rationalistic pressure and to explain away as erroneous or the result of Jewish misconceptions much of the positive teaching of the Apostles is shown all through this little treatise.¹ Towards the end the author ventures on what in an Anglican is surely a rash task—the explanation of how Christ is present in Holy Communion, for there more than anywhere else he is left by his uninspired Church to his own conjectures. And the result is not happy. Because he does not distinguish between the Sacrament and the Sacrifice he is unable to interpret the Fathers who did. He implies (p. 111) that the Eucharist is not a true Sacrifice, and he confounds the presence of our Lord as God in the sanctified soul with His sacramental presence in His Human Nature in Holy Communion (p. 119). The almost complete ignorance of Catholic teaching (which at least carried on the Christian tradition) that marks these pages is a striking commentary on the Anglican claim to identity with the pre-Reformation Church, and explains the chaotic state of Anglican theology. There is no sign that the profound studies of the great Catholic theologians from St. Thomas onwards on this central dogma of the faith have been read, much less mastered. And there is clearly obvious, too, that dread of the supernatural which forms the theme of a paper elsewhere in this issue. In his pathetic anxiety to win over those who do not admit the miraculous, our author goes so far as to say—

It is not inconceivable that a generation hence it will be generally

¹ It is hardly credible considering the subject, but we have searched this book in vain for any assertion or any clear implication (beyond the use of capitals for the pronouns) that the author holds our Lord to be very God!

admitted that One who was perfect man, and in whose case the material body was completely interpenetrated by His spiritual faculties, might have accomplished the "miracle" of the Resurrection *without any interference with the laws of nature.*¹

Here the flag of the fortress is definitely hauled down.
Non tali auxilio!

J. K.

A Review worth reading.

We are so accustomed to the agnostic, unCatholic or definitely anti-Christian tone of many of the periodicals that represent the cultivated thought of modern England that it passes amongst us almost without comment. We take it for granted and it so fits in with the air we are compelled to breathe that we do not realize how pestilential it is, just as the Esquimaux unconcernedly inhales in his igloo an atmosphere that would stifle a Caucasian. It is only when we come across a paper which happens to assume the truth of the Christian position and envisages events at home and abroad in the light of Christian principles that we can grasp how much we have to put up with from the rest in the matter of distorted facts and unwarranted inferences. We are given that salutary experience from time to time in the pages of the *Saturday Review*, which almost alone of English non-Catholic weeklies has grasped the true inwardness of the Masonic misrule of Portugal and Rome. Most other periodicals adopt the stereotyped anti-Catholic attitude of the foreign Press-agencies, according to which the Church is permanently in the wrong, always reactionary, obscurantist, opposed to education, liberty, and "progress," lustful of dominion, the enslaver of consciences, whilst everything anti-ecclesiastical is *ipso facto* praiseworthy. But a notable exception must be made in favour of one comparatively modern enterprize, the quarterly called *The Oxford and Cambridge Review*. In form it is equal to the best, being excellently printed on good paper and in substance it is ahead of all its rivals, for not only does it treat with knowledge of matters of weight and interest, but, as implied above, it is Christian in its criticism and in its sympathies, and it does not treat the concerns of the oldest and most widespread of the Christian communities from the narrow insular standpoint

¹ Pp. 25, 26. Italics ours.

of English Protestantism or English rationalism. We have noticed the names of eminent foreign Catholics amongst its contributors, we have seen in the substance of its contributions many signs that Catholic sources have been utilized and the Catholic attitude accurately determined, we have found, in a word, what we were led to expect, but in vain, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, matters of religious belief stated "in the terms and according to the interpretation accepted by those who hold them." It is true that the quarterly is Conservative in politics, but Catholic Liberal readers may fairly be asked to bear with that feature in view of the other good qualities just indicated. We are likely to wait a long time before we find in other non-Catholic periodicals of like standing two such articles as appear in the October issue, "The Evangelization of Paris since the Separation," by M. Georges Goyau and, "The two Romes of To-day," by A. delle Rive. Such influences in literature as this Review is showing itself to be are rare enough, and Catholics would do well to encourage them.

J. K.

Mr. Lacey's Rejoinder.

In some *Flotsam* pages last month I ventured to criticize the inferential argument by which the Rev. T. A. Lacey, in the *Church Times* for September 8th, sought to prove that Bishop Thirlby and Dean Boxall, whilst Archbishop Parker's prisoners between 1563 and 1570, made no difficulty about receiving Anglican Communion in the Archiepiscopal Chapel. I called attention to an entry in the Report of a Visitation of the diocese of Canterbury in 1569 (*Dom. Eliz.* lx. n. 71), in which it is stated that "in the Archbishop's private chapel prayers were read daily, communion was celebrated four times a year, and there were frequent sermons, but neither Drs. Thirlby and Boxall nor their servants come to Communion." And I professed, as modestly as I could, my preference for this piece of solid fact to Mr. Lacey's perilous inference. In the *Church Times* for October 20th Mr. Lacey, in the pleasantest of tones, takes note of this criticism, and does not hesitate "to lay bare the wound" which, as he puts it, the touch of my rapier inflicted. "Down," he says, "went my carefully constructed argument like a house of cards." Still he took heart of grace, and went anxiously to the Record Office to see if anything would perchance turn up to restore his

spirits. Apparently something did. He got out *S.P. Eliz. Dom.* lx. n. 71, and "in five minutes" he "was happy." The entry ran thus, written straight across the paper in one line :

Habet { preces quotidianas
communiones trimestres } in sacello suo ; *ad quas*
conciones frequentes
non veniunt { *Dr. Thirlebye* } nec servi eorum ad communionem.
 { *D. Boxal* }

But the words here italicized, which are the words we cited against Mr. Lacey, are, he says, in another handwriting from the rest of the document, and a handwriting "coarse and unlike any in use at that time ;" whilst "in the name *Thirlebye* and in the first *ad* there seems to be a clumsy attempt to imitate the court hand." To Mr. Lacey the conclusion seems "inevitable." The words italicized are "a gross and palpable interpolation. . . . It is probably impossible to ascertain when, by whom, or for what purpose the words were interpolated ; but interpolated they are, and as evidence they are worthless." Accordingly he is sure that "if Father Sydney Smith had seen the document himself he would have noted the character of the words and would not have cited them"; and remarks, in a spirit of perfectly legitimate chaff, in allusion to my moral that he should be less adventurous in his inferences, "Shall I add a gentle admonition upon the perils of uninspected documents?"

It is true I had not inspected the document itself when I wrote last month. I was writing in the country, where it would not have been very feasible to come up to London for a visit to the Record Office, but I gave what—when one is only writing a little fugitive paper—is usually thought sufficient, the immediate reference from which I took the passage, namely, Father Norbert Birt's *Elisabethan Religious Settlement*. At all events, in the present instance, if I ran a risk, the risk does not appear to have landed me in any very serious predicament. I have been to the Record Office since I saw Mr. Lacey's rejoinder in the *Church Times* of October 20th. That the words referring to Thirlby and Boxall are written in a different hand from that of the writer of the whole document admits of no doubt, and to this extent I agree with Mr. Lacey ; but when we come to Mr. Lacey's judgment that this other hand is "a coarse hand unlike any in use at that time," or that the addition is by an

unauthorized person belonging to some different period, which can only be set down as a worthless, and (?) fraudulent interpolation, I must beg to differ. In the first place, how could the supposed misdemeanant have got access to the document so as to practise on it? The Record Office copy is the very document sent in by Parker's Chancery to the Crown. It would have been a highly risky, if a possible, procedure to tamper with it before it left Parker, and it is hard to conceive of circumstances under which it could have been got at, or any one could have wished to interpolate it in this sense, after it passed into the Royal Chancery. On the other hand, there is nothing improbable in some authorized person, in other words some one of Parker's higher officials, having made the insertion under higher direction before it went on to the Crown. Indeed, when one reflects, it is just the sort of fact which the ordinary clerks of the Visitation would not have felt able to insert themselves, but would have left, as savouring of *la haute politique*, to some higher authority to judge of; nor does it affect the question in the least that there is besides this another insertion in a different hand. Why should all the additions be in the same hand?

There remains the question of the handwriting itself which Mr. Lacey judges to be unlike any of that age, in other words to belong to a much later age. When I saw it I did not take this view, for it seemed to me quite what one might expect to find in MSS. of that age. But I do not rely on my own judgment in such a matter, and so asked my friend and colleague, Father J. H. Pollen, who has considerable experience of Elizabethan MSS., to inspect it and give me his opinion on it. This he has done, and I submit it in his own words.

I have just been examining the document *Dom. Eliz.* vol. 60, No. 71, and I have no doubt that the addition "ad quas tamen non veniunt, etc." is the most authentic part of the whole document. The body of the paper is in the hand of a common, fair-copying scribe; this is the addition of some higher official, perhaps the man who originally drafted the document, and who has revised it before it was sent in to the Government office. If one were to photograph the handwriting and compare it with other records of Archbishop Parker's chancery, one would in all probability find many more instances of it.

Be this however as it may, the hand is clearly that of one trained in the sixteenth century, and probably in the *earlier part* of that century, whereas the other scribe shows later characteristics. Thus the "a" of the second hand is not made as we now do, with a half moon curve,

closed by a straight down stroke. The down stroke begins with a short turn from the left, like the top of our written "r." This was a relic of the Gothic "a"; and it is no longer found in the younger scribe, who copied the body of the paper.

Other evidence of early sixteenth century fashions which went out later, are (1) the virgule at the end of the line, instead of the stop, (2) the exact observance of the rules for long "f" and short "s," and for "v" and "u," when these letters are respectively initial or not-initial. (3) The distinction between Roman hand for the Latin words and court-hand, for the English names (Thirlebye and Boxal). (4) The forms of small "c" with a horizontal stroke at top, and "r," written like a modern "v," and the abbreviation for "um" in the word "eorum" are all old.

Though these features are not conclusive of mid-sixteenth century work when taken one by one, their simultaneous occurrence afford a strong argument that this scribe learnt to write in the earlier part of the sixteenth century.

Had I found myself to have made an illegitimate citation, I should of course have used what some one has called the privilege of an English gentleman by handsomely withdrawing it, but now it seems as if Mr. Lacey would be the one entitled to use this privilege; yet not, surely, by any "painful confession," after this "joyous passage of arms," which has not turned on any very big matter.

I must decline to remark on the matters bearing on continuity which Mr. Lacey goes on to discuss, for I too find the controversy about continuity unspeakably wearisome. But in case he should still be disposed to take to his aeroplane and tear himself free from my little position on *terra firma*, I must warn him that he has still to get free from the evidence furnished by Sander's Report to Cardinal Moreri, written in the middle of 1561 (see *Catholic Records Society*, Miscell., vol. i). According to Sander, who was evidently well-informed, the offer of liberty on condition they would attend Protestant services, even without receiving Communion, was made to most of the deprived Marian Bishops and refused; which shows that this was a point on which they had made up their minds and held the same strong views as any modern Catholic would. Of Thirlby, in particular, it is narrated by Sander that "he was offered freedom from confinement without being obliged to receive Communion, if only he would attend the public prayers. He answered the visitors that his conscience was not yet satisfied that he could comply. . . . The visitors, moved by the hesitancy of his answer, granted him a respite till another time, when they again made

the same offer. He said: 'Unless I should be willing to dissemble I cannot go to your prayers.' Of Boxall, too, Sander tells us that he said he preferred his prison to the Archbishop's house. "Meanwhile he begged that he might live in some private pension house, but in vain; for he altogether declined the condition on which it would have been conceded, viz., that of coming to public prayers." As Mr. Lacey likes inferences, may I infer from this that, if during their subsequent residence with Archbishop Parker, these two dignitaries had shown themselves so pliant as to attend his services and Communion, they would have at once been released from their captivity, and left to go where they would. This surely is another piece of weighty evidence against Mr. Lacey's contention, but let me point out to him that he must take the two pieces of evidence, this and the entry in the Visitation Report of 1569, together, for they confirm each other. And then lastly there is the entry of Thirlby's burial in the Lambeth Parish Register, which describes him as having "in the time of the noble King Edward professed the faith of the holy Gospel, and afterwards, in the time of Queen Mary, returned to Papistry, and so continued the same to his end, and died the Queen's prisoner, within my Lord Grace's house at Lambeth." Not so, surely, would he have been described had he in his latter days rejoiced the Queen's Majesty and my Lord's Grace by attending Anglican services. I must honestly confess, however, that I have not been down to Lambeth Parish Church to consult this Register. I have taken the extract from the Rev. George Phillips' *Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy*.

S. F. S.

Reviews.

1.—BELLARMINE'S LETTERS.¹

FOR many years past Père le Bachelet has been collecting the unpublished papers and letters of Cardinal Bellarmine, with the intention of bringing them out as an *Auctarium*, or Supplement, to the already published works. Circumstances, however, have made this larger scheme impracticable, and he has

¹ Bellarmin avant son Cardinalat (1542—1598) Correspondance et documents. Par X.-M. le Bachelet, S.J. Paris: Beauchesne. Pp. xxxiv, 559. Price, 12 fr. 1911.

contracted it into one which perhaps will prove more convenient, namely, to group the papers into classes according to the distinctions of subject-matter, and bring these out in separate publications, each in its original language, with explanatory introductions and notes in French. These publications will appear at intervals, and the first, announced as to be expected almost at once, will contain the papers bearing on the relation of Bellarmine to the Sixto-Clementine edition of the Vulgate. It will, therefore, be particularly welcome, and should supply a felt want in our theological literature. The Letters under this revised scheme, Père le Bachelet deals with separately. About a hundred and forty-six of these were published as far back as 1650, by Father James Fuligatti, all of which belong to the period subsequent to Bellarmine's elevation to the Cardinalate. We gather that Père le Bachelet has, in the course of his researches, found many more belonging to this same period, which, if so, he will probably publish later on. For the present, he confines himself to the publication of the letters written from the beginning of Bellarmine's life to the date of his elevation, a period which covers fifty-six years, and is represented by 107 letters from Bellarmine's own pen, and 149 written to him or concerning him. This period includes the time of his childhood at Montepulciano; his studies at Rome, Florence, Mondovi, and Padua; his *début* as a young preacher and professor at Louvain; the thirteen years of his professorship at the Roman College, during which he established his peculiar fame as a controversialist by the lectures which afterwards took permanent shape in his great work, *De Controversiis*; his journey to France as theologian to the Legate, Gaetano; his work on the Pontifical Congregations; his Rectorate of the Roman College; his Provincialate of Naples; his services as theologian to Clement VIII. This period "was thus the ladder," says Père le Bachelet, "by which he climbed from the simple life of a professor or writer, to the life externally more brilliant of a Prince of the Church and counsellor of Popes."

The subject-matter of some of these letters will be found too much occupied with theological refinements for the mass of readers, but this will recommend them all the more to theological professors. Especially will this be the case with the letters referring to the celebrated Louvain controversies which broke out in 1587, between Lessius and some doctors of the University of Louvain. These controversies bore on the nature

of efficacious grace, predestination, and final perseverance, some questions as to the nature of biblical inspiration coming in incidentally. The impression of the Louvain Jesuits was that they had been stirred up by Michael Baius, whose own doctrine had been condemned not long before. They caused considerable friction for the time between the University and the Society's professors, but are interesting as marking a stage in the unfolding of a theological system which is now perfected. Lessius, being threatened with the doctrinal censures of the University, wished his position to be clearly understood at Rome, and also to have the sanction of a theologian so highly thought of there as Bellarmine. This was the occasion of the correspondence which Père le Bachelet now for the first time gives to the world. Other letters of interest are those relating to Bellarmine's great work, *De Controversiis*. In some we learn of the great favour with which it was received. At Frankfort, three years after its publication, it was selling so fast that if 2,000 more copies had been sent there, they would have been bought at once. At Louvain and Antwerp about the same time, a similar eagerness to purchase it was manifested. On the other hand, we read of difficulties which it encountered, not merely from the displeasure of Sixtus at its teaching (what, after all, was the commonly received doctrine) that the Pope is not the Lord of the Earth *in temporalibus*, or from the Court of Spain which thought it conceded to the Pope too much authority over kings; but also from some Fathers of the Society who were opposed to it as a whole. Thus, in the summer of 1591, that is, some months after the death of Sixtus V., Father Arator writes from Austria to Father Aquaviva, saying that the opinion of learned prelates in those parts, is that the book has done the Church more harm than good, and, so far from depriving the heretics of arms, has provided them with arms. "Nowhere could the Calvinists and Lutherans find such strong arguments for their sects as in Bellarmine's book, and he weakens the force of the recognized Catholic arguments, and points out to heretics how they may dispose of them" This charge caused grave distress to Bellarmine who, writing back to the General, does not conceal his annoyance. It is, however, only the sort of charge narrow-minded men are apt to bring against those who see further and more deeply than themselves.

Other subjects on which the letters throw light are the compilation of the *Ratio Studiorum*, the strange institution

called the *Monarchia Sicula*, and the history of the Translation of the Western Empire from the line of Theodosius to that of Charlemagne.

For defining the personality of Bellarmine the letters give us some help, but not as much as we should like. Little traits, however, are preserved for us like that by Father Lorin, who testified that during his sojourn "whatever hour of day or night he went to see Bellarmine he found him deep in prayer with God, interceding with Him for that Church [of France], for many centuries so glorious, now if not in imminent still in probable danger of destruction." In several places, for instance in his letter to Salmeron of July 19, 1584, he reveals himself as quite human in his tendency to see things only from his own side. At the desire of Father Possevin, then in Poland, he had written a treatise on the Translation of the Empire from the Greeks to the Franks, on the further Translation from the family of Charlemagne to the Saxons, and on the Seven Electors—all to show in reply to Matthias Illyricus that the Roman, that is the German Empire, was the creation of the Apostolic See. It had passed the Society's censors and been shown to Gregory XIII., who had referred it to Cardinal Sirleto, an old and venerated friend of Bellarmine's. But

the said Cardinal kept it for some months, praising it highly to Father General and others who spoke to him about it, even saying that he had never seen a finer book on the subject. Nevertheless, speaking to our Lord [the Pope] he persuaded him that it was not good for the book to be published, so as not to seem to bring into dispute the authority of the Holy See over the Empire, the Apostolic See being in possession. . . . Father Possevin continually presses me . . . but nothing is done because no one dares to oppose Cardinal Sirleto, in whom His Holiness believes more than in all the rest of us. Thus the lie runs freely.

Bellarmino here manifests an impetuosity which is only human in one conscious that he had produced an effective bit of controversy, but one cannot help feeling that Sirleto's motive for withholding publication was sound.

Père le Bachelet assures us that the documents are published just as they are, without omissions or alterations, and in their completeness except for some few which in no way bear upon the thought or character of Bellarmine, but refer to individuals and their private concerns only. "What does it matter," he

says, "to the sanctity of Bellarmine or the solution of any theological problem, whether the venerable servant of God was a Molinist, or a Thomist, or something between the two, as a Congruist? But it is essential that in a work of objective character, he should be made to say what he did say, neither more nor less."

2.—POLITICS AND ECONOMICS IN FIFTH-CENTURY ATHENS.¹

Greek civilization differs from our own both in its material environment and in its feelings and ideas. Our method will be to deal first with the main features of that environment; next with the political institutions which the Greeks established within it; next with the means of livelihood, that is, with their "economics" or housekeeping; and lastly with the conflict which arose, as it has arisen in many modern civilized communities, between the driving necessities of economic development and the accepted institutions and ideals of national life.

Such, in his own words, is the scope of Mr. Zimmern's book on the Politics and Economics of Fifth-Century Athens. Despite the brilliance of that wonderful period, the genesis of its greatness and the routine life of the men to whose combined efforts that greatness was due, are too little appreciated, if not seriously misunderstood. With the one and the other Mr. Zimmern has made himself thoroughly familiar, and *The Greek Commonwealth* embodies the results of his researches. Mr. Zimmern has fully equipped himself for his task. No stranger to the hills and valleys of Greece, steeped in the literature (ancient and modern) of his subject, and gifted with vivid imagination and a rare power of expression, he has written a brilliant and fascinating work.

In a country which owed much to its "environment," some knowledge of its physical conditions is essential. But Mr. Zimmern is wary, and rightly recognizes that "environment will not explain more than a small part of a nation's history." For all that, these chapters will help us to listen with a little less impatience to the angry growls of the Acharnians, to grasp the full significance of the Decelean Occupation, and

¹ *The Greek Commonwealth. Politics and Economics in Fifth-Century Athens.* By Alfred E. Zimmern, late Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. Lecturer at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Clarendon Press. Pp. 454. Price, 8s. 6d. net. 1911.

to realize the necessity for those drastic corn-laws, writ so large on the Athenian statute-book. But all this is but an introduction to the study of the City-State, "the centre and inspiration of all the most characteristic achievements of the Greeks." The patriotism of the Funeral Speech was no sudden growth, as our author recognizes. It was the culmination of a long process of development, which began away back before the migrations. At first a nomad, the family his most sacred bond, plunder his usual occupation, the future Athenian was gradually fitting himself for the task of self-government. When it came, he was equal to his responsibilities—how equal Mr. Zimmern shows. But Athens was fated to go further, and to take her place among the empires of the world. However, in our interpretation of Athenian imperialism we are not in entire agreement with Mr. Zimmern. We feel—perhaps unjustly—that the author is under the spell of the Funeral Speech, and too willing to put implicit trust in a somewhat biased, if brilliant, biographer. There is so much in the history of the Empire that is hard to condone: while Thasos and Aegina (and Chalcis too) recall painful memories. It may be that the empire-builders "were not conscious of any wickedness; they were too busy with their work." But "garrisons," "overseers," and "closed mints" are to us aspects of that baneful *πολυπραγμοσύνη* which all but annihilated the local administration of justice throughout the Empire.

The third part of this volume is delightful reading. Here, in dealing with "Economics," Mr. Zimmern is on his own special ground, and his chapters are full of strange surprises. We are startled to hear that "the pioneers who created our European civilization were stricken by incredible poverty all their days," that "ancient Greek finance was parochial, almost childish, in its methods," that "the Greeks never recognized any distinction between a 'trade' and a 'profession'" (a doctor with four shillings a day!), that the Greek merchant "is, in fact, skipper, and shipper and merchant all thrown into one." Incidentally, Mr. Zimmern has some excellent criticisms of the so-called Greek prejudice against labour, while in a subsequent chapter he attacks with some vigour the popular idea that slave labour was the basis of Greek civilization. "So we may clear the name of Athens from one cruel reproach which has clung to it ever since the human conscience began to concern itself with these questions." We cannot help wishing that at some future

date Mr. Zimmern will give us another work entirely devoted to the question of Greek Slavery. His own researches have made it abundantly clear that we need to reconsider our stereotyped opinions.

The Chronological Table, two Indexes (one of Modern Writers), and two Maps, will be found useful.

The Clarendon Press is to be congratulated on the general attractiveness of the book.

3.—A HANDBOOK FOR THE TEACHER.¹

Father Kruz has given us in this work a pedagogical treatise of much erudition and great common-sense. His conception of what is fundamental in Pedagogics seems to us to hit the right mean between pure theory on the one hand and empiricism or specialism on the other. We have seen pedagogical treatises purporting, like this book, to deal with the groundwork of the subject which were, in reality, little more than essays in psychology; while, in the other direction, a great deal of practical literature on teaching is so entirely divorced from general philosophy as to be quite useless to any but the professional schoolmaster. Father Kruz includes historical criticism of great educational movements and revolutions, such as the Renaissance and the Reformation, as among the most important prolegomena to modern Pedagogics, and his analysis of the actuating forces in these movements is a dispassionate and scholarly piece of work, which enables the reader to estimate the contributions of each to educational theory, at the same time that it indicates clearly the germs of failure and disaster involved in all such deflections from the Catholic ideal. His summing up of Luther's influence on education touches a controversy which is perhaps more living and actual among Luther's countrymen at the present day than among ourselves. We imagine that in England the old legend of the Reformation as the dawn of intelligence and education among the masses is now-a-days little better than a spent and discredited myth.

Among the other features to which we should like to call attention in Father Kruz's work is his treatment of the ethical side of education. His description of the Christian type of character is exact and well-conceived, and the practical maxims

¹ *Pädagogische Grundfragen.* Von Dr. Franz Kruz, S.J., S.T.D. Innsbruck: Rauch. Pp. xi, 450. Price, 3.00m. 1911.

he deduces from it show him to be not less at home in the practical work, than in the theory, of education. Especially interesting is his treatment of school problems, such as discipline, organization, and curricula. In regard to such questions, the English reader must, of course, make his own applications of the author's criticisms, which are naturally directed to the requirements and circumstances of modern Germany.

4.—A POSTHUMOUS WORK OF WILLIAM JAMES.¹

The aim of this work, which has been published from MS. left by the late William James, is to "round out" the system of philosophy which he has constructed, a system "which now is too much like an arch built only on one side" (Pref. vii.). The title of the work was to have been "An introductory textbook for students in metaphysics." But unfortunately Professor James died before he could complete his work. Consequently the present publication is "fragmentary and unrevised," and most of the problems which the author proposed to discuss (cf. p. 29, seq.), are left unsolved.

James adopts the scholastic definition of Philosophy as "the knowledge of things by their ultimate causes, so far as natural reason can attain to such knowledge" (pp. 5, &c., cf. 15). His method, too, is rather scholastic than pragmatic. First he states his thesis and explains it; then he puts difficulties, which he proceeds to answer briefly and not ineffectually. His opposition of "the philosophic way" of teaching to "dry dogmatic ways" (p. 6) is suggestive. "At a technical school a man may grow into a first rate instrument for doing a certain job;" but philosophy should teach us graciousness of mind, gentlemanliness, and breadth of mental perspective (pp. 6, 7). The apparent cessation of philosophic progress is only apparent, the fact being that as fast as questions get accurately answered, the answers are called scientific, and what men call "philosophy" to-day is but the residuum of questions still unanswered (p. 10, cf. 23).

The first problem discussed is, "How comes the world to be here at all, instead of the nonentity which might be imagined in its place?" (p. 38). But to this question, "the darkest in all

¹ *Some Problems of Philosophy: A Beginning of an Introduction to Philosophy.* By William James. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Pp. ix, 237. Price, 4s. 6d. net. 1911.

philosophy," no answer can be given. One thing is clear: "there are novelties, there are losses." But "we cannot burrow under, explain, or get behind" fact (p. 46).

In Chapters IV. to VI. the discussion turns upon "the difference between thought and thing," which for James is the same as the difference between concept and percept (p. 47). The tendency towards sensationalism and nominalism which characterizes all his writings is apparent here. "The concept 'man,' to take an example, is three things: 1, the word itself; 2, a vague picture of the human form which has its own value in the way of beauty or not; and 3, an instrument for symbolizing certain objects from which we may expect human treatment when occasion arrives" (p. 58).

Between his account of the nature of the concept and his account of its function, James does not notice any incompatibility. Concepts are but man-made symbols (p. 69); yet our conceptual system "suffices all by itself for purposes of study. The 'eternal' truths it contains would have to be acknowledged even were the world of sense annihilated" (p. 74). James prefers percepts to concepts, and to illustrate the inferiority of the latter, alleges that "they falsify as well as omit, and make the (perceptual) flux impossible to understand" (p. 79). In his endeavour to prove this, he falls into the usual blunder of the evolutionist, and confuses the manner in which the concept means or signifies things with its content, *i.e.*, with what it means, as we apprehend that meaning. Surely because our concepts are one, simple and changeless in their own nature, it does not follow that what is meant or apprehended in the concept is one, simple and changeless. True, we sometimes conceive motion as a "summation of parts" (p. 84, 88); but we do so only for the purposes of mathematical calculation, and are quite aware that our concept does not represent the real nature of motion. The common-sense concept of motion and change, though itself changeless, is none the less valid; for change does not change; it is things that change, and these we conceive as changing.

Another charge that is brought against concepts is that "novelty finds no representation in the conceptual method, for concepts are abstracted from experiences already seen or given" (p. 98). Percepts, however, are no better off, for they *are* experiences already (being) seen or (being) given. And if the terms which conception uses "to divine the new" are "ready-

made and ancient," at any rate it can make new combinations, which perception can not, except under the guidance of the concept.

The remaining chapters, which treat of the respective advantages of (1) Monism and Pluralism, "(2) the conceptual and perceptual views of 'Novelty and the Infinite,' and (3) of 'Novelty and Causation,' we must leave to the reader." *Some Problems of Philosophy* is an interesting book, written in the easy and vigorous style so characteristic of the leader of American pragmatists; but with its conclusions we can hardly agree, and its arguments are to our mind inconclusive.

5.—THE TEACHING OF THE CLASSICS.¹

Father Corcoran's volume comprises two separate studies, the first one being suggested by the discovery at Madrid of a complete copy of the *Janua Linguarum* issued in 1611 at Salamanca by the Irish Jesuits, who then directed the college of their nation in that University.

The *Janua Linguarum* has a claim to attention by the fact that copies of the original are extremely rare, though it exercised a great influence on methods of teaching during the century in which it was published. The original, planned and carried out by Father Bathe and his colleagues, was annotated and re-edited by others, not always with discrimination, nor with the acknowledgments due to the author. The object of the work was to acquire with ease and certainty, and the least possible delay, a working familiarity with foreign languages. In the seventeenth century there were none of those elaborate grammars and exercise-books for learning modern languages with which we are now so familiar, and a student desirous of acquiring foreign tongues had to use the direct method of speech. Father Bathe developed this method into a system by making a careful selection of words to form a vocabulary, and weaving these into sentences which served the double object of fixing the meaning of the words in the mind and at the same time of giving a working knowledge of the grammar of the language. That he recognized the limitations of his plan is seen from a hint which

¹ Studies in the History of Classical Teaching, Irish and Continental. By the Rev. T. Corcoran, S.J., Professor of Education in the National University of Ireland. Dublin: The Educational Company of Ireland, Ltd. Pp. xviii. 308. Price, 7s. 6d. 1911.

he gives of possibly in the future providing a scheme for the use of his sentences in a formal grammar process. The fortunes of the book, and its modifications in the hands of Comenius, Schoppe and others, are an interesting chapter in the history of education.

The second part of Father Corcoran's work deals with the wider question of classical teaching from the time when this aimed at developing the use of speech, that faculty which separates men from the brutes, till it became merely the servant of philological or archæological research. If the author does not attempt a solution of the claims of the classical and modern sides, he supplies abundant material for thought, and not the least interesting of his chapters is that on a school at work, in which is describing the working of a class-room in a Jesuit college in the seventeenth century; the smallest details are noted, even the places of the scholars being indicated by a diagram.

With this all too brief account of a book, which not only gives evidence of research but presents it in so stimulating a manner, we will conclude a notice which is so short only because in the limited space at our disposal no part of the subject could be selected for an extended review, without relegating to an unjust obscurity the remaining portions. The National University of Ireland may well be congratulated on securing to its staff as Professor of Education one who has thus proved himself in the field of research, and who at the same time demonstrates in every page of his work that the lore of the past is not of mere academical interest, but is above all a stimulus and a guide in the living controversy of the present. The land which peopled Europe with scholars and which never lost the love of learning, is entitled to be heard in these days, not the less that it has always preserved the heritage of the Faith, the corner-stone of all true knowledge.

6.—"JOHN AYSCOUGH'S" LATEST.¹

It is with no unduly biassed feeling towards a contributor of our own that we proclaim Mr. Ayscough's latest novel to be one of a thousand. One may range the circulating libraries for a twelvemonth without happening upon its equal—*nec viget quicquam simile aut secundum*. For almost alone of contem-

¹ Hurdcott. By John Ayscough. London: Chatto and Windus. Pp. 393. Price, 6s. 1911.

porary novelists, the author possesses in a high degree the faculty of describing noble *souls*, whether the nobility be that of mere nature or the far rarer quality that is engendered from the union of nature and grace. In *Hurdcott* he has added another to that rapidly-growing gallery of exquisitely-drawn female characters which began with *Marotz*,—simple, unselfish, sympathetic natures whose sheer goodness calls forth the best in the natures around them. "Marotz," "Dromnina," "Gillian," and now "Consuelo," they are all clearly of the same high lineage and have the same fundamental moral features, but they are differentiated, not only by qualities evoked by their different circumstances, but by subtle variations of personal dispositions. It may be that latest impressions are the most vivid, but we suspect that in "Consuelo," the author has reached his highest conception hitherto. So powerfully conceived, and so consistently painted is this beautiful character that she will surely exercise upon the reader much of the sweet influence which she shed upon her companion-creations. We are not going to summarize the story which some reviewers, we notice, have called a Tragedy. It certainly purifies by pity and horror according to the definition, but it can only be a tragedy for those who have no conception save of earthly happiness. There is no gloom about its ending for all its sorrow, and if the reader has grasped the spirit of the tale he would not have it otherwise. And there is still less gloom about the course of the tale itself, which in fact sparkles throughout with all the Ayscough humour whether of phrase or situation. Not Thomas Hardy nor George Eliot herself has surpassed the author in the portrayal of the comic side of English rustic life. It is hard to quote examples, for the humour is generally scattered like gold-dust in the sand, but occasionally one comes across a nugget like this :—

"Take my word for it, Mrs. Billett" [it is the village schoolmaster that is speaking, at a time when the Church in England was still in the catacombs], "the Roman Catholics as a body are neither married nor given in marriage—like the angels in heaven."

"Well, but, Mr. Kite," said Mrs. Billett, "it's natural in the angels, being all ladies as anyone can see by their clothing, tho' old-fashioned."

"Nay, ma-am," Obed replied, with his learned smile, that had almost a clerical smack in it, for he was parish clerk as well as schoolmaster; "you're not strictly accurate there; the angels aren't all of your amiable sex. There was Tobit's friend, the 'Pocrypha angel, for instance."

"Potiphar weren't no angel by what I've heerd," sniggered the postman.

"Tut, tut, Mr. Musselwhite," cried the landlady, "let's have no talk of that sort here: in church is bad enough but not in this well-conducted tap."

"And you're mixing up Poitphar and his wife," said Mr. Kite. "A little learning is a dangerous thing; drink deep or, Mr. Musselwhite, avoid the Pierian Spring."

As the postman could not readily avoid the spring in question, through ignorance of its whereabouts, he adopted the alternative, and raising his tankard aloft, drank deep (p. 5).

A hundred little clearly-etched vignettes like the following show the author's power of depicting the country-side no less cleverly than the rustic mind.

Now and then a thick cloud of starlings fluttered up, and sank down again a hundred yards away, as if a handful of titanic black dust had been flung up from the earth. There was a patch of ploughed land dotted with the white breasts of plovers, whose bodies were invisible as they sat motionless; perhaps they knew that the white spots on the dark brown earth looked like so many flints (p. 231).

But what the Catholic reader will value more than wit or picturesque description is the true sense of spiritual values displayed throughout, the demonstration, so to speak, of the natural truth of the Catholic ideal, the insistence on the fact of Christianity as the only explanation of the world. We move in the serene atmosphere of faith, above the miasmas that breed doubt and despair. And yet there is no preaching or controversy; in fact, nearly all of the characters are non-Catholic till near the end, and there is no parade of conversions. It is, perhaps, all the more persuasive on that account.

One might point to a few flaws, coincidences of which the art is not concealed and the like, and one might perhaps question the possibility of a young man like Hurdcott who has lost all self-respect and has no religious conviction to restrain him remaining pure in thought and deed amidst corrupt companions in whose other iniquities he fully shares, but such blemishes do not materially affect the general impression. When one considers the literary garbage that degraded women write and unprincipled publishers issue in these modern times we cannot be too thankful to Mr. Ayscough for showing that it is possible to combine the highest principles with a choice and treatment of matter that is capable of exciting the highest interest.

7.—A HANDBOOK OF CHURCH HISTORY.¹

By his *Enchiridion Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, which is a Latin translation from the second and revised edition of a Dutch original, Father Albers will earn the gratitude of all interested in Ecclesiastical History, whether priests, ecclesiastical students, or educated laymen. It is always a difficulty, when one wishes to approach an historical subject for the first time, to know where to go for an appropriate synopsis, one which is not too short to be of real use, and not so long as to confuse one's first ideas. Father Albers has hit the happy mean. In these three volumes he summarizes the whole of Church history, from the birth of Christ right down to the present day, and he does it so clearly and concisely that in an hour or so one can make oneself acquainted with the leading points of any historical episode or doctrinal controversy. Of course he does not go beyond outlines, but for those who wish to penetrate deep into any of the various subjects, he provides excellent bibliographical lists at the head of each section, further supplemented by foot-notes to each page, in which, together with the primary sources and classical works, are given the latest contributions of modern experts.

One turns naturally to the portions dealing with England as likely to afford a test how far accuracy has been attained in details. It has been attained in a very commendable degree, save, curiously, in the last section which deals with England in the nineteenth century. Here the account is decidedly poorer, and the author has got confused amidst the variety of English religions and religious parties. Thus we are told that as a result of the Dissenters obtaining liberty of worship in that century, "the High Church was much reduced and became almost entirely extinct among the poorer classes," which is rather amusing of a time when the High Church party made such wonderful progress; but the fact is he confuses the High Church with the old High-and-dry. Again, among Protestant Missions no mention is made of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Church Missionary Society, the two which together outnumber, we imagine, all the rest put together. Not only in the pages devoted to English Church history in its most recent stages, but altogether the final part of

¹ *Enchiridion Historiae Ecclesiasticae universae*. Auctore P. Albers, S. J. First Latin Edition. Malmberg: Neomagi; London: Herder. Three Vols. Pp. vii, 327; 443; 382. Price, 17s. 1911.

the book falls short of the standard previously attained. This last portion, in fact, shows signs of over-haste in the preparation. But we must not grumble when the fare on the whole is so good, especially as it is a book likely to pass through many editions, in which these and other minor defects will doubtless be remedied. Still, in view of such future revision, we would also suggest that, when the Latin names of towns or countries are given, the vernacular name should be added in brackets. Such names as Neomagi, Gratianopolis, Herbipolis, are rather annoying to those who have not a suitable Lexicon by them, and Ulota (for Ulster) seems quite unnecessary.

8.—ILLUMINATED MANUSCRIPTS.¹

The volume on *Illuminated Manuscripts* contributed to Methuen's "Connoisseurs' Library" by Mr. J. A. Herbert, is quite admirable as an *œuvre de vulgarisation* of the highest class; indeed it may be regarded as a model of its kind for subsequent contributors to imitate. What has perhaps impressed us most is the fact that the book is in the first place eminently readable. That the illustrations should be skilfully chosen and satisfactorily reproduced, that the information given should be ample and accurate, is only what one would take for granted in the work of an official of large experience in the Manuscript Department of the British Museum. But that the author in what might easily have become a sort of glorified guide-book to the great libraries of Europe, should contrive to write clearly and interestingly, throwing his facts into proper perspective and never leaving the reader with the sensation that he is perusing a catalogue, is a result which can only have been attained by a great expenditure of pains, supplemented by literary skill of no mean order. It would be invidious to mention examples to the contrary, but such examples exist in abundance. Mr. Herbert, on the other hand, gives proof of a quite remarkable gift of artistic characterization, a quality which is almost as valuable in a book of this kind as good reproductions of the works which he is describing. We may quote almost at random a passage in illustration. The writer is discussing the embellishments of early Celtic manuscripts:

It only remains to mention the figure subjects, usually portraits of the Evangelists, occasionally a few scriptural scenes also, which the

¹ By J. A. Herbert, "The Connoisseurs' Library." London: Methuen. Pp. xii, 358. Price, 20s. net. 1911.

Celtic illuminators unfortunately found it necessary to introduce into their works. Their genius, as has already been said, was for pattern-weaving, space-filling, symmetry; their world was a flat one, their art two-dimensional. The result of applying these peculiarities to the human figure may be imagined. Man, as seen by the Celtic artist, is a purely geometrical animal. His hair is a series of parallel lines or neatly-fitted curves, his eyes, two discs set symmetrically in almond-shaped frames, his nose an interesting polygonal device, his dress, cut up into arbitrary compartments, his straight toes and fingers, and his doll-like stare complete our *ensemble*, which may be successful as a decorative pattern, but has no relation to real life.

Let it not be supposed that Mr. Herbert is wanting in appreciation of the wonderful interlacing strap and ribbon ornament so characteristic of the Celtic illuminator. As he says, "In its disposition of lines and masses, its dexterous manipulation of a few forms and colours to form patterns of endless variety, it has never been surpassed," and he goes on to speak with enthusiasm of "feasting our eyes on the exquisite beauty of some of the pages in such books as those of Kells, Lindisfarne, or Lichfield." But what we have quoted suffices to illustrate how vivid and just is Mr. Herbert's gift of making us see with his own discerning eyes the qualities and defects of the work which he is criticizing.

It is part of the scheme of the book to discuss the illuminator's art throughout the whole range of Western manuscripts, and the author, without tying himself down to any too formalized divisions, passes rapidly from period to period and from country to country. We may especially commend the section dealing with early English work (Chapter VII.), but Mr. Herbert is at home with all schools and all periods, and one of the most commendable qualities of his book is the absence of any attempt to run fads or force doctrinaire theories of art upon the reader. The criticism is throughout just and natural. As regards the arrangement of his materials also Mr. Herbert seems to us to have nearly always struck a happy mean. The only point we have felt tempted to regret is perhaps the rather excessive amount of space given to miniatures, to the prejudice of the attention bestowed on merely decorative illumination. This disproportion also extends to the illustrations, although we confess that we should be very sorry to part with any of the beautiful miniatures of the later French and Italian schools which are so attractively reproduced in the volume before us. The one criticism which we venture to make upon these admir-

able half-tones concerns rather the letterpress than the pictorial part of the plate. It seems to us that it would have been well to indicate in some way what relation the block as reproduced bears to the size of the original. There is nothing to prevent even a careful reader from carrying away the impression that the page which he sees, for example, of the Lindisfarne Gospels, represents accurately in scale as well as in outline the wonderful traceries of the original artist.

9.—ROMAN BRITAIN.¹

It is remarkable that the first really comprehensive work on Roman Britain, at any rate from an administrative point of view, should have been produced, not by an Englishman, but by a young French *docteur en droit et ès-lettres*, working under the auspices of the Université de Besançon. From whatever source it has come the book is an excellent one, and we heartily congratulate Dr. François Sagot upon his achievement. Probably if the same task had been essayed by an English scholar, the point of view would have been somewhat different. The reader of the present work has a sense throughout that the Britain of the Roman occupation is being looked at as a Ptolemy might have looked at it, or as we ourselves at the present day might study Chile or the Argentine. Still there is not a shadow of unfriendliness in Dr. Sagot's tone. Neither does he regard our northern island merely as the scene of a successful military demonstration, or as one stage of development in the expansion of the great Roman Empire. Much attention is devoted to economic and social life, and the author has been diligent in acquainting himself with the results of recent research in so far as they throw any light upon the condition of the inhabitants under Roman rule. But still his standpoint is the very natural one of an outside observer who is interested rather in the Roman Empire than in the inhabitants of Britain. As a consequence his book loses a little in warmth, and as the dry bones of history in this obscure period are already bare enough, the reader must be prepared for some rather desultory reading of a not very stimulating kind.

Scientifically, however, Dr. Sagot's work gains in value by his reticence and by the care with which he resists the temptation to generalize. He contents himself for the most part with a statement of facts, reserving such wider deductions as he

¹ *La Bretagne Romaine. Par François Sagot, docteur en droit et ès-lettres. Paris: Fontenaille et Cie. Pp. xviii, 418. Price, 12 francs. 1911.*

thinks may safely be drawn for the final chapter, which he entitles *Conclusion*. As regards arrangement, the whole work is divided into four parts. The first supplies a narrative of the conquest of the island extending from the expedition of Julius Cæsar in B.C. 55 to the recall of Agricola in A.D. 84. Part II. is concerned with the more peaceful history of Britain as a Roman province during the second and third centuries. Naturally the wall and the vallum occupy a prominent part in this portion of the work, but separate sections are accorded to the questions of "provincial administration," the military defence of the territory occupied, and the municipal organization of the principal settlements. With the advent of Diocletian to power a new organization seems to have come into force throughout the province of Britain. The working of this for the remainder of the Roman occupation supplies Dr. Sagot with material for his third main division. Finally the economic and social life of the country during the whole period of Roman rule are dealt with in the fourth part. Dr. Sagot has certainly studied his materials very thoroughly. The inscription in the C.I.L., the literary sources, and other such primary authorities, seem to have been exhaustively examined, and his bibliography in these directions leaves nothing to be desired. We are not quite so sure that he has always had the opportunity of following up the records of chance discoveries and local excavations. For example, we believe that he might profitably have made more use of the materials provided by the series *Victoria County Histories*, notably the contributions of Messrs. R. A. Smith and Walters in the *History of the County of London*, and that of Mr. Haverfield in the first volume of *Hampshire*. Another point which we should have expected to find more fully developed is the question of the Roman roads. The tradition of English historians has always been to make much of the great lines of communication such as Watling Street and the Fosse Way, which knit the scattered Roman *coloniæ* together.

In the final paragraph of his book Dr. Sagot remarks with truth: "Situated upon the very limits of the civilized world, Britain was poor, thinly peopled, and far more undeveloped than Gaul, when the Romans invaded it. In this condition it still remained, despite notable progress, down to the time when the foreign occupation came to an end." In view of this rather melancholy conclusion Dr. Sagot may be heartily congratulated on having imparted as much interest as he has done to so uninspiring a theme.

Short Notices.

MESSRS. BURNS AND OATES have fittingly celebrated the Jubilee of the publication of Father Dalgairns' classic treatise on the Holy Eucharist by bringing out a sort of *édition de luxe* in two volumes (**The Holy Communion: its philosophy, theology, and practice**, Ninth Edition, 7s. net.), with a Preface by Father Allan Ross. As the Editor points out, the advance of scientific knowledge during these fifty years leaves Father Dalgairns' philosophical position practically intact; his theology, too, needs no recasting: it is only when we come to his Third Part, the practice of Holy Communion, that we realize the great change brought about in Catholic thought by Pope Pius' bold return to primitive discipline concerning the frequency of reception. Father Ross points out clearly in his Preface how Father Dalgairns in deprecating daily Communion for the ordinary Christian, considered that in all but exceptional cases its disadvantages outweighed its advantages—an opinion which was the predominant, though not the only one of his time, but which by the authoritative teaching of the Pope has since been declared mistaken. The chapter, therefore, on *The Limit to Holy Communion* is refuted by the Papal Decree, and must be discounted by the reader. We cannot but think that it would have been better omitted altogether, or else that the mistaken assumptions in the author's argument should have been pointed out in notes on the actual text. For the ordinary reader cannot but be impressed by the skill and apparent cogency of the author's reasoning, and when told that it is nevertheless fallacious, will feel inclined to doubt his authority on other parts of the subject. With this exception, we can heartily commend this beautiful edition of a celebrated work.

In nothing is the altered discipline of the Church more apparent than in the regulations regarding the age of admission to the Holy Eucharist. In the earliest times infants at their baptism and frequently afterwards were communicated with either species, and the "age of discretion" was not fixed as the time for First Communion until the beginning of the thirteenth century. M. l'Abbé Louis Andrieux, in **La Première Communion: histoire et discipline** (Beauchesne, 3.50 fr.), has composed an exhaustive study of the whole question which illustrates the fact that the modern teaching is no novelty, but a judicious return to a view and a practice never formally abandoned by the Church.

The difficulties which Miss G. P. Curtis, the editor of the **American Catholic Who's Who** (Herder, 8s. 6d. net.), had to encounter in the compilation of her gigantic work may be gauged from the fact that out of 8,000 applications for biographical records only 2,500 finally find their place in the book. Many neglected to respond, others considered the work as ministering to vanity and social ambition, others again—whom we find hardest to forgive—although they had the highest claims to be registered, refused to appear. Considering that the compiler's scope includes the States, Canada, the Philippines, Cuba, and Americans living abroad—a total of not less than 20,000,000—the result cannot pretend to be exhaustive. But of its utility as far as it goes there can be no question, and no doubt each succeeding

issue—there is no indication that it is meant to be an annual—will add to its worth. The notices are for the most part interesting and business-like, and they give a striking picture of the manifold activities that occupy Catholics in America. The omissions will probably be more noticeable in the States than they are here, where the volume will do much to make the Church across the ocean better known. The notices would be more pleasing to the eye if some varieties of type were used ; for instance, in giving the titles of books, etc.

The excellent little *Lives of the Friar Saints* series continues to make progress with satisfactory regularity. In addition to the four volumes already published, the Lives of **St. Pius V.**, by C. M. Antony, and **St. John Capistran**, by Father Vincent Fitzgerald, O.F.M. (Longmans, 1s. 6d. each), have just appeared. The former deals with the personality of one who is necessarily of great interest to English folk, whether Catholic or not, for he it was that excommunicated Queen Elizabeth. His life, therefore, gives a valuable opportunity of stating the circumstances which gave the Supreme Pontiff the right, freely recognized by the public opinion of Christendom, of calling a ruler to account for grave dereliction of duty. Moreover, as the Pope was famous as an Inquisitor, occasion is given for setting forth the conditions which made the Inquisition in its circumstances a necessary and praiseworthy institution. Both these points are elaborated with great cogency by Mgr. R. H. Benson in a Preface contributed to this volume. St. Pius was engaged in other important affairs, but in none more important than in the naval crusade against the Turks which culminated in the victory of Lepanto, so striking an instance of the power of our Lady's intercession.

Father Fitzgerald's work is also concerned with a Saint who more than a century before had been instrumental in first breaking the power of the infidel on land at the great Battle of Belgrade in 1456. But this crowning exploit occurred at the very end of St. John Capistran's life, which had been spent in continuous labours for the restoration of Christian piety and the extirpation of heresy in Italy and Germany during the disastrous years which followed the great Schism. It is a wonderful record of evangelical toil and miracle, and throws besides much light upon the history of the Franciscan families, for St. John held high office amongst the Observantines.

Both volumes are well illustrated and attractively bound.

In a finely conceived and delicately phrased series of spiritual essays—**The Holy Viaticum of Life as of Death** (Benziger, 3s.)—the Rev. Daniel Dover, D.D., pleads for the recognition of the Holy Eucharist as the constant support of life's journey, taking for his inspiration the history of that "lover of the Sacramental God," St. Stanislaus. The book, although inclined to be rhapsodical in style, is the outpouring of genuine devotion, and cannot fail to arouse the like in right-minded readers.

Within the limited scope suggested by its title, **Short Readings for Religious** (Washbourne, 3s. 6d.), by the Rev. Charles Cox, O.M.I., should effect much good by keeping before those who use it the full implications of their religious profession. The whole complexus of their obligations is set forth in a series of fifty-two readings in a style which, if not conspicuously eloquent, is clear and flowing.

The Bishop of Verdun, Mgr. J. A. Chollet, is one of those courageous French prelates who have been prominent in their opposition to the iniquitous education laws of the infidel Government. In France more than anywhere else at present the battle of Christianity has to be fought in the school-room,

Hence the peculiar opportuneness of Mgr. Chollet's volume, *Les Enfants* (Lethielleux, 2 fr.), in which the Bishop discusses in what moral responsibility consists, and how soon, generally speaking, it awakens in the child, what are the claims of the child, of the parents and the State respectively, how the Decree about First Communion should be carried out, and finally what measures should be taken to protect children from the immoral school-books forced upon them by the *loi scolaire*. Such clear and bold speaking should be at once a guidance and an encouragement to French Catholics.

Translations of his many ascetical works have made the name of Père Grou, a Jesuit who died during the period of the Society's suppression, familiar to English readers who have learnt to admire his pure and lofty spirituality. Yet, whatever was the cause, this holy man shows himself for the most part strangely forgetful of the rock whence he was hewn. We do not refer to the taint of Quietism which seems to attach to some of his doctrine on prayer, but to the fact that he almost wholly ignores the spirit and system of the Exercises of St. Ignatius. This characteristic appears in a hitherto unpublished manuscript, *Retraite Spirituelle sur les Qualités et Devoirs du Chrétien* (Lethielleux, 2.00 fr.), recently edited by one of his brethren, in which he alludes to the Exercises merely as well-suited to lead the sinner to God, as if they were unfitted to carry him further on the way of perfection. However, the present work is well worthy of its author's reputation for tender piety, and its editor has been careful to note and correct the points which are likely to be taken in a Quietistic sense.

Yet another edition of Dame Juliana's *Revelations!* But this booklet, *Comfortable Words for Christ's Lovers* (Allenson, 1s. 6d. net), edited by Rev. D. Harford, M.A., differs from the other English editions in being transcribed from a shorter and presumably older MS. purchased by the British Museum in 1909. The editor conjectures very reasonably that it is a first draft from which, after twenty years further mystical experience, the longer version was expanded. His work is well and lovingly done, the introduction is useful, the spelling is modernized, and the punctuation and arrangement skilfully adapted, but the quaint diction is left which adds such force to the deep spiritual truths expressed.

Without agreeing with Arnold's belief that culture can replace religion, we may hold that religious poetry is a peculiarly apt medium to convey spiritual impressions. And hence the value of Miss Mary Tileston's collection, called *The Stronghold of Hope* (Methuen, 2s. 6d. net), of poems and hymns calculated to bring comfort to the sick or sorrowful. The permanence and perfection of joy to come, the medicinal and transient nature of earthly tribulation, the transforming influence of faith and hope and love, have all been beautifully expressed by a multitude of singers, many of the best of whose hymns and lyrics have been brought together in this dainty volume.

The "*Notre Dame*" *Series of Lives of the Saints*, issued by Messrs. Sands and Co. at 1s. 6d. net. per volume, has made an auspicious start in the *Lives of St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland*, and of *St. Margaret, Queen of Scotland*, both by anonymous authors. Both are "popular," not critical, *Lives*, although the writers are not blind to the difference between fact and legend. The marvellous stories connected with the early days of Patrick, and indeed abounding throughout all his life, are told as giving an idea of the mentality of the times in which they were written, but the autobiographical Confessions alone are relied on for the facts. In the career of St. Margaret, who was married to Malcolm Canmore, the slayer of Macbeth, we are still within the region of legend, but it is easier to separate the false from the

true. Her story is excellently told by one who evidently loves Scotland and her one woman Saint with true devotion.

The review of Dr. Boyd Barrett's *Motive-Force and Motivation Tracks* in our last issue will have called our readers' attention to the interesting experiments in the psychology of the will which are being carried on at the Catholic University of Louvain. The actual records of those experiments have now been published as part of the *Travaux du Laboratoire de Psychologie expérimentale de l'Université de Louvain*, under the title of *Etude expérimentale sur le Choix volontaire et ses Antécédents immédiats* (published by the University at 5 francs), by MM. A. Michotte and L. Prüm. The mysterious power of self-determination which distinguishes the rational being forms one of the most fascinating regions of research, and if the heart could be plucked out of it, it would surely be by elaborate and detailed experiments like these, pursued with infinite patience and scientific skill. Upwards of a hundred books and treatises on the Will, including those of Bradley, Stout, W. James, and Ward, are quoted in the investigation, and show that the experimenters are abreast of all modern theories.

These belong to the present glories of Louvain. Its past fame has been adequately chronicled by another of its professors, M. H. de Jongh, in *L'Ancienne Faculté de Théologie de Louvain (1432-1540)* (Smeesters, Louvain : 6 fr.). These dates comprise the first century of its existence, a period never adequately described hitherto, and yet of much importance because concerned with the strenuous opposition offered by the Louvain Professors to the dangerous novelties of Erasmus and the heresies of Luther. M. de Jongh has gone very thoroughly to work, tracing the beginnings of the Theological School and its relations with Humanism before that movement showed itself definitely hostile to Christianity. The whole is a masterly study of an important epoch.

Doctor Sebastian Reinstadler's excellent compendium, *Elementa Philosophiæ Scholasticæ* (Herder, 2 vols : 7s. 6d. cloth), now in its fifth and sixth edition [we confess we do not understand how a single issue can thus be described], has been so often commended as combining brevity with clearness and actuality with regard for tradition that we need only say here that the author has taken advantage of this issue to make several useful additions and improvements.

Canon Lejeune, of Charleville, in *Vers le Ferveur* (Lethielleux : 2.00 fr.), has reprinted a course of instructions on Christian perfection in the world which he addressed in the first instance to a sodality of ladies in that city. They are full of wholesome instruction and eminently practical.

At a time when the spread of the Boy Scouts has brought the Red Indian to his own again, the re-publication of Sir William Butler's *Red Cloud: a Tale of the Great Prairie* (Burns and Oates : 3s. 6d.), is particularly opportune. An introduction by General Baden-Powell points the moral of these exciting pages, which are more than a mere tale of adventure.

The tone of hostility towards Latin Catholicity which marks the pamphlet *Choses Inédites de Terre-Sainte*, by M. R., makes one rather distrustful of the "facts" related concerning the guardianship of the Holy Places. However, it is of common knowledge that the presence there of Greek and Latin, both under the thumb of the infidel Turk, has resulted in a state of affairs the reverse of edifying. M. R. has painted a picture thereof in vivid colours, the correctness of which only personal experience or its equivalent, the account of an author of acknowledged honesty and impartiality could enable one to judge.

Two little Anglican treatises of devotion—**Voices of Prayer** (Longmans : 2s. 6d. net.), and **Some Aspects of Meditation** (Mowbray), both by "Sister M. E.," have reached us from their respective publishers. The first is an elaborate paraphrase with much philological learning on the eighty-sixth (our eighty-fifth) Psalm ; full nevertheless of a serene piety and faith. The other and smaller book seems to us rather fanciful and vague in its treatment, although the conception of prayer therein sketched is sound enough.

A very beautifully got-up book is **The Order for the Consecration of an Altar**, in Latin and English, published by the Cathedral Library Association of New York at half-a-dollar. No one who reads this beautiful rite can fail to appreciate how completely the Great Sacrifice enters into the essence of true Christianity.

A former military chaplain in the French army—the infidel Government abolished the office in 1880—has written or compiled for the benefit of young conscripts a collection of **Récits de la Chambrée** (Beauchesne, 3.00 fr.) barrack-room stories illustrating the virtues, hardships and heroism of a soldier's life. The author is not a Kipling, but his tales may be read with interest as illustrating the ideals of a military nation.

Literature on the comparative study of religions is growing apace. In **Jésus-Christ et l'Etude comparée des Religions** (Lecoffre, 3 fr.), Father Valensin gives the substance of five lectures delivered before the Catholic Faculty at Lyons on the Christological problem as it is affected by the science of religion. The facile and futile methods which would discover analogies between Mithraism, Buddhism, and Christianity, and make the last a mere evolution of the former, are exposed, while the true conception of Christ is established on a historic basis by an appeal to the Jewish idea of the Messiah and the statements of early Christian writers.

A third edition of **La Devotion au Sacré-Cœur de Jésus** (Beauchesne, 4.25 fr.) has just appeared, and while Father Bainvel still claims not to have extended the scope of his previous work, which was simply to expound the doctrine of the devotion by facts and texts, these in their historical setting have developed a welcome aroma of living devotion. Apart from this, the book has a special value in the eyes of the student from the abundant references to documents.

La Sacra Liturgia (Marietti, 8 fr.), by Ugo Mione, is a useful little publication in two volumes which describes the origin, development and meaning of the Church's liturgy and the present practice. Its compactness makes it very serviceable to the priest who wishes to instruct his flock in the Church's liturgy, while the foot-notes indicate further sources of information.

A second edition of Father Gatterer's **Katechetik** (Rauch, m. 3.40) has been prepared by Father Krus, and is marked with the thoroughness which is so characteristic of German enterprise. After giving a brief review of the history of religious instruction from the earliest times down to the present, the author lays down twenty-seven principles which are to guide the teacher. It is in these principles that the chief value of the work lies, for they secure those that apply them from the mechanical rigidity which has of late invaded the school-room, and which would be nowhere more disastrous than in the domain of religion. Religious education is not to be gauged by a tabulated report of examination results, but by the whole career of the child afterwards.

Father Piccirelli, in his **De Catholico Dogmate Universim** (D'Auria, 3.00 l.), which looks like a monograph written for a Doctorate in Theology, has produced a work which cannot fail to be most welcome to all students of the problems of Modernism. After an introductory chapter on Hermes and

Günther the author devotes a section to each of the best known representatives of Modernist thought, and quotes freely from their writings, being careful to add in a foot-note for the benefit of the student the original text so that it may be confronted with its Latin translation. The Catholic doctrine is then laid down, and the examination of the Modernists resumed in such a way as to indicate where the error creeps in. Marginal notes and a good index help to make the book eminently serviceable.

The earlier editions of *Rudimenta Linguae Hebraicae* (Herder, 2s. 6d. cloth), by Drs. Vosen and Kaulen, have already been noticed in these pages with high commendation. It will then suffice to say that Professor Schumacher, who re-edits the ninth, keeps all the distinctive merits of his predecessor, whilst adding several improvements, especially in the *Pars Practica*. Hebrew Grammars, as a rule, bring forth briars and thorns abundantly. Professor Schumacher has done much to clear these away, and by intelligible statements, practical exercises, well selected passages, and useful vocabularies, has put a fair knowledge of Hebrew within easy reach of any one who can read a Latin Text Book without difficulty. The text is excellently set out, and, what is of the highest importance to beginners, the Hebrew type is large and clear.

The list of the **Patriarchs of Constantinople** (Cambridge University Press, 2s. 6d. net.), compiled and annotated by C. D. Cobham, is worth studying, if only to realize the unhappy state of a Church deprived by its severance from the Holy See of the power of effective resistance against the encroachments of the State. There were over 300 Patriarchs in the course of fifteen centuries, from A.D. 315, and of these more than half were deposed and not a few murdered. But the greater part of this curious little book is taken up by two Introductions, by Dr. Adrian Fortescue and Rev. H. Duckworth, a Protestant Professor, respectively, both dealing with the history of the Patriarchate, the one in twenty, the other in forty-seven pages, and giving somewhat contradictory accounts of its genesis and character.

Nora's Mission, by Mary Agnes Finn, is a well-conceived story of Irish and Australian life, which flows pleasantly and ends happily.

Amongst smaller publications are **Why must I suffer? A Talk with the Toilers** (C.T.S., 1d.), by Mother Loyola of York, a gently-persuasive exposition of the Gospel law,—no cross, no crown. In three further numbers the author of **A Pilgrim of Eternity: the Story of a Unitarian Minister** (C.T.S., 1d. each), brings his profound analysis of religious thought outside the Church to a close. **Suffer Little Children to Come unto Me** (Sands, 3d. net.), is a short account of the meaning of the Blessed Sacrament and the dispositions for receiving It, adapted for young minds. Mother Loyola has also compiled **The Little Children's Prayer-Book** (Burns and Oates: 6d. net.), an excellent little manual confining itself to Morning and Night Prayers, Devotions for Mass and Aids to Confession and Holy Communion, which are developed at considerable length with abundant explanation. **The Eucharistic Decrees of Pope Pius X.**, by Father H. Lucas, S.J., forms one of the Preston *Catholic Evidence Lectures*. **Days of First Love**, by W. Chatterton Dix, is the fourth impression of a beautiful poem in honour of our Lady which was first published in 1900. Finally **The Pious Christian Manual** (Sands: 1s. net.), is a Prayer Book compiled from the *Pious Christian* of Bishop Hay, containing a great variety of prayers not commonly found in our manuals of devotion.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice).

BEAUCHESNE, Paris.

Bellarmin et la Bible Sixto-Clémentine. By Père X.-M. Le Bachelet, S.J. Pp. xi, 210. 1911. *Les Récits de la Chambrière.* By Abbé Georges Ambler. Pp. xxviii, 297. Price 3.00 fr. 1911. *La Dévotion au Sacré-Cœur de Jésus* (3e édition augmentée). By Père J. V. Bainvel. Pp. x, 497. Price, 4.00 fr. 1911. *La Première Communion.* By l'Abbé Louis Andrieux. Pp. xxxiii, 392. Price, 3.50 fr. 1911.

BENZIGER, New York.

Stuore. By Michael Earls, S.J. Pp. 251. Price, 3s. 3d. net. 1911.

BUREAUX DE LA REVUE D'HISTOIRE ECCLESIASTIQUE, Louvain.

L'Ancienne Faculté de Théologie de Louvain. By H. de Jongh. Pp. 268, 20, xlvii. Price, 6.00 fr. 1911.

BURNS AND OATES, London.

Red Cloud. By Sir W. D. Butler. Pp. xii, 332. Price, 3s. 6d. 1911. *The Holy Communion.* By J. B. Dalgairns, Cong. Orat. Edited by Allan Ross, Cong. Orat. 2 vols. Pp. xxiii, 480. Price, 7s. net. 1911. *The Little Children's Prayer Book.* By Mother M. Loyola. Pp. 125. Price, 6d. net. 1911.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

The Mishna on Idolatry. 'Aboda Zara. By W. A. L. Elmslie, M.A. Pp. xxix, 136. Price 7s. 6d. net. 1911.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, London.

Why must I suffer? By Mother Mary Loyola. Pp. 64. Price, 1d. 1911. *A Pilgrim of Eternity.* By M. N. Nos. 8, 9, 10 and 14. 1d. each.

CHATTO AND WINDUS, London.

Hurdcott. By "John Ayscough." Pp. 393. Price, 6s. 1911.

DUCKWORTH AND CO., London.

The Roadmender. By Michael Fairless. 28th edition. Illustrated by E. W. Waite. Pp. x, 121. Price, 7s. 6d. net. 1911.

GABALDA, Paris.

Jesu-Christ et l'Etude comparée des Religions. By P. Albert Valensin. Pp. 232. Price, 3.00 fr. 1911.

HERDER, London.

Enchiridion Patristicum. Auctore M. J. Rouët de Journal, S.J. Pp. xxiv, 888. Price, 11s. cloth. 1911.

INSTITUT SUPERIEUR DE PHILOSOPHIE, Louvain.

Etude expérimentale sur le Choix Volontaire. By MM. A. Michotte and E. Prüm.

LETHIELLEUX, Paris.

Vers la Ferveur. By Chanoine P. Lejeune. Pp. 270. Price, 2.00 fr. 1911. *Les Enfants.* By Mgr. J. A. Chollet, Bishop of Verdun. Pp. viii, 214. Price, 2.00 fr. 1911.

LONGMANS AND CO., London.

Voices of Prayer. Pp. xii, 98. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1909. *The Religious Question in Public Education.* By Various Writers. Pp. vi, 350. Price, 6s. net. 1911. *Saint Pius the Fifth.* By C. M. Antony. Pp. xiv, 114. Price, 1s. 6d. 1911. *Saint John Cupistran.* By F. Vincent Fitzgerald, O.F.M. Pp. xii, 115. Price, 1s. 6d. 1911.

METHUEN, London.

The Stronghold of Hope. Compiled by M. W. Tileston. Pp. xiv, 310. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1911.

MOWBREY, London.

Some Aspects of Meditation. By Sister M. E. New edition. Pp. 63. 1910.

ROBINSON, Bristol.

Days of First Love. By W. Chatterton Dix. Fourth Edition. Price, 2d. post free.

SANDS AND CO., London.

The Pious Christian Manual. Pp. xv, 450. Price, 1s. net. 1911. *Suffer Little Children to come unto Me.* By a Religious. Pp. 30. Price, 3d. net. 1911.

WASHBOURNE, London.

Nora's Mission. By M. A. Finn. Pp. 268. Price, 2s. 6d. 1911. *Short Readings for Religious.* By F. C. Cox, O.M.I. Pp. viii, 264. Price, 3s. 6d. 1911.

SOME FOREIGN REVIEWS.

Summary of Contents.

I.

Revue Bénédictine. (1911). III. and IV.

H. Quentin.—Dismembered Manuscripts.

P. Bihlmeyer.—An uninterpolated text of the Apocalypse of Thomas.

J. Chapman.—Cassiodorus and the Echternach Gospels.

G. Morin.—The Würzburg Gospel lists and the Roman Basilicas.

A. Wilmart.—The Psalter of MS. Regina 11., its date and provenance.

A. Wilmart.—The age and order of Mone's Masses.

II.

La Civiltà Cattolica. Oct. 7 and 21.

The Masonic Feast of Sept. 22.

The Genesis of Luther's "New Learning."

Benedetto Croce on the Jesuit conception of Law and Morality.

The Conflict between Sociology and Moral Teaching.

In Modern Etruria.

The Family and modern Industrialism.

Forbidden Books of Gottescalc the Monk and the Controversy on Predestination.

The Crypt of the Popes and the Chapel of St. Cecilia in Callisto.

Modernism and its campaign against Clerical Celibacy.

III.

Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie. (1911). IV.

E. Dorsch.—SS. Augustine and Jerome on the Truth of historic statements in the Bible.

H. Weismann.—The Second Part of the Book of Wisdom.

C. Kneller.—St. Cyprian and the Roman Church.

H. Bruders.—The Petrine Texts and early Christian exegesis
—The Donatists.

IV.

Revue Pratique d'Apologétique. Oct. 1 and 15.

J. Rivière.—The Dogma of the Redemption and the Catholic understanding of it.

E. Mangenot.—The Eucharist in St. Paul.

L. Labauche.—Letters to a Student concerning the Blessed Eucharist.

A. de Poulpiquet.—The solidarity among the grounds of Faith from the point of view of Apologetic.

H. Lesître.—Preaching and Dogma.

E. Beaupin.—Chats with a Missionary—exterior worship and internal life.

J. Guirand.—Catholic attempts at Reform before Luther.

V.

Stimmen aus Maria Laach. (1911.) IX.

P. Lippert.—A clear Road for human Freedom.

H. Pesch.—A Revolution in the organization of Political Economy.

W. Fox.—An eventful three years in the History of the Premonstratensian Order.

C. Blume.—The Origin of the *Te Deum*.

J. Kreitmayer.—The Art Metropolis of Southern Germany.

VI.

L'Université Catholique. Oct. 15.

A. Chagny.—A Champion of "New France"—François Picquet.

C. de Lajudie.—Prejudiced History and True History.

Abbé Delfour.—Patriotism.

R. Parayra.—The Apostolic "Signatura."

